THE Mennonite Quarterly Review

BOARD OF EDITORS
HAROLD S. BENDER, *Goshen College*, Editor

GUY F. HERSHBERGER, *Goshen College*
EDWARD YODER, *Scottdale, Pa.*
C. HENRY SMITH, *Bluffton, Ohio*
CHRISTIAN NEFF, *Weierhof, Germany*
JOHN UMBLE, *Goshen College*
ERNST CORRELL, *Washington, D. C.*
ABRAM WARKENTIN, *Newton, Kansas*
BENJAMIN UNRUH, *Karlsruhe, Germany*

VOLUME XII OCTOBER, 1938 NUMBER FOUR

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 204

THE THEOLOGY OF PILGRAM MARPECK 205
John C. Wenger

ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1937-1938 257
Silas Hertzler

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE LIFE AND WORK OF PILGRAM MARPECK 269
John C. Wenger

EDITORIAL

In the July Issue of the Review, John C. Wenger Presented an informing article on the life and work of Pilgram Marpeck. In the present issue Dr. Wenger, now an instructor in the Bible School of Goshen College, continues with a study of Marpeck's theology, based on the writings of this greatest leader of the South German Anabaptists. The present article also makes constant reference to the theological views of the Swiss Brethren in general, giving the reader a rather comprehensive doctrinal view of Swiss and South German Anabaptism as a whole. Another fruitful study in Anabaptist theology would be a comparison of the views of Marpeck and the Swiss Brethren with such Dutch and North German leaders as Menno Simons and Dirck Philips. The editors hope it will be possible to present the readers of the Review with such a study sometime in the future.

Following the Practise of Previous Years, the Review Presents in the final issue of the year an annual report on attendance in Mennonite schools and colleges. This statistical study for the academic year 1937-1938 is the tenth consecutive annual survey of this kind by Professor Silas Hertzler. The present report is not quite as comprehensive as that of last year. As explained at the time of the last report the Review has adopted the policy of excluding from these reports minor schools with only a local patronage, especially if they are not well established and the statistical information is difficult to obtain. It is interesting to note, however, that in the current report, including fewer institutions, the total number of students is not far below that of last year.

THE
Mennonite Quarterly
Review

VOLUME XII NUMBER 4

THE THEOLOGY OF PILGRAM MARPECK

JOHN C. WENGER

1. *Prolegomena*

The Anabaptists were characterized by a fervent love for the Scriptures, and the will to follow resolutely the teachings of the New Testament in their daily living. The faith of the Brethren, or the Brethren of the Covenant, as they often called themselves, was emphatically, loyally Biblical. We of today, though differing now and then in details from the views expressed by Marpeck, may nevertheless listen with much profit to the note of certainty in the writings of this man who recognized the Scriptures to be the very Word of God. Through all of Marpeck's writings one feels that he is content with his position only if it is Scriptural. The Bible is the "plumbline,"[1] of his own theological structure, as well as that of others. The Holy Scriptures "cannot be broken."[2] Their infallibility is of course due to divine inspiration; the writers were "moved by the

1. T B 252. The symbol T B represents *Taufbüchlein* (Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper), also known as the *Vermahnung* or *Das Buch der Bundesbezeugung,* 1542. The pages here given are as of the reprint in the *Gedenkschrift* of 1925.

2. John 10:35; quoted in V 515. The symbol V is used for the *Verantwortung* (Vindication), in reply to Schwenckfeld's *Judicium* (Criticism) of the T B. Dr. Loserth published it in 1929: *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der oberdeutschen Taufgesinnten im* 16. *Jahrhundert. Pilgram Marbecks Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung von* 1542. Wien und Leipzig [Germany]. The abbreviation Q & F will be used when referring to Loserth's introduction or notes in this volume.

Holy Spirit."[3] Indeed, "The Holy Spirit (we assert) wrote the evangelical and apostolic Scriptures through the hands of the evangelists and apostles; it is therefore God's or the Holy Spirit's Scripture (writing) . . . II Tim. 3 [16] Rom. 1 [2]."[4] With this high view of the Bible, moreover, went the recognition of the necessity of its sane use, for one finds many passages which, although not really at variance, yet do appear to contradict each other.[5] One dare not snatch a verse out of its setting and misapply it.[6] In this sensible and sound view of the Scriptures Marpeck and his collaborators were in perfect accord with the position held by the Swiss Brethren from the inception of the church in 1525. A few years ago John Horsch wrote a carefully documented monograph on this theme.[7]

In the matter of the canon, Marpeck's position is not perfectly clear. He occasionally quoted from the Book of Wisdom[8] and from IV Esdras,[9] and a few times from Ecclesiasticus (Sirach),[10] Tobit,[11] the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs[12] and Baruch;[13] and he once referred to Susanna,[14] of the apocryphal additions to Daniel. Yet, with possibly one exception,[15] he never called the apocryphal books "Scripture." It is entirely possible that he viewed these books somewhat in the same light as Luther did; that is, although not inspired, yet profitable for reading. And after all, approximately seventy-five apocryphal citations are negligible when compared with the thousands of canonical passages quoted in Marpeck's three extant works.[16] As far as direct references to the canon are concerned, Marpeck employed the following precise expressions: "The Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament,"[17] "The Holy Scriptures of the New Testament,"[18] and "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New

3. II Pet. 1:21; quoted, V 520.
4. V 521
5. V 291
6. V 239
7. "The Faith of the Swiss Brethren," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, IV, 4; V, 1, 2, 3. Especially in this connection, note chapter II on "The Doctrine of the Scriptures."
8. V 192, 202, 221 etc. T E represents *Testamentserläuterung* (Testament Explanation) pp. 58A 76B 97B etc.
9. V 192 194 200 etc. T E 85B 111B 112A etc.
10. V 219 222 224 etc. T E 328A
11. V 224 278 511f.
12. V 330 375 380 505
13. T E 328B
14. V 427
15. V 224
16. T B, T E and V
17. V 329
18. V 436

Testaments."[19] Attention should also be called to the fact that Marpeck named the Old Testament books in part after those in the Vulgate. I and II Samuel are often called I and II Kings. I and II Kings are then III and IV Kings. The books of the Chronicles are often given their Latin names, I and II Paralipomenon. Similarly, Judges is Judicum and the Book of Wisdom is Sapientia.

In one important respect Marpeck and the Swiss Brethren, as well as Menno Simons and the Dutch Anabaptists, differed from contemporary, and to some extent modern, Protestantism. This difference concerned the relation of the Scriptures of the Old Testament to those of the New. Both Testaments they held to be God's Word, inerrantly true. Yet they took the principle of progressive revelation seriously, holding the relation of the Old Testament to the New as "that of promise to fulfilment, of type and shadow to reality, of the groundwork of a building to the building itself."[20] They found their viewpoint confirmed in Christ's Sermon on the Mount where He set His word over against that which Moses had written at a lower stage of revelation, and because of the "hardness of heart" of the Israelites. They found the book of Hebrews especially emphatic in presenting this contrast in priesthood, sacrifices, atonement, mediatorship, and the general theme of promise and fulfilment, type and antitype, shadow and reality. As indicated in a previous article [20a] this was the theme of the *Testament Explanation* of about the year 1544. A few extracts will serve to indicate the general tenor of this work.

> Therefore the Scripture holds all the forgiveness of yesterday [the time of the Old Covenant] for no [real] forgiveness to eternal salvation, because it left all men, believing and unbelieving, under the law, the curse, sin and death until [the time of] Christ . . . (Gal. 4, Gal. 3, Rom. 5).[21] Today for the first time is there real forgiveness, taking away, canceling and forsaking of sin.[22]

In the chapter on Rest,[23] Marpeck found rest in the Old Testament period to consist of two forms. First, the Jewish Sabbath; second, national peace in Palestine. Under the new Covenant, believers enjoy a real spiritual rest and have the prospect of the eternal

19. V 371
20. John Horsch: *loc. cit.*, V I, p. 21.
20a. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, XII, 3, p. 162.
21. T E 4. Marpeck's Bibles were naturally not divided into verses.
22. T E 5A
23. T E 44A

Sabbath in the glory world.[24] The best inheritance the Old Covenant had to offer was a temporal earthly inheritance, a long national residence in Canaan.[25] In the former era faith had two aspects: First, an expectation of temporal blessings; second, the promise of eternal, spiritual, *future* blessings.[26] In this connection Marpeck quoted the eleventh chapter of Hebrews at length. All the Old Testament patriarchs died in faith, *not having received the promises* (Heb. 11:13).

The Brethren seem to have developed a rather clearly-defined "covenant theology." The Lord made a covenant with Noah promising never again to blot out mankind with a flood.[27] Again He made a covenant with Abraham, promising him and his seed a national home in Canaan and giving him circumcision as the seal of the covenant;[28]—all of which was a type of the eternal covenant which He would one day make with the true Israel, accompanied by circumcision of the heart, the new birth.[28] God renewed His covenant with Isaac, with Jacob and with the Children of Israel.[28] And the law of Adam and of Moses is also called a covenant,[29] the latter, a covenant of life.[29]

The New Covenant, "Today," was made by the Man Christ Himself. That is, it was not made with the blood of animals. But the incarnated Son of God Himself made the New Testament or Covenant with His own blood.[30] These words Testament and Covenant are bound together, and when we think of Testament today we should also think of Covenant.[31] The real,[32] genuine covenant is made for the first time through Christ as a New Covenant. Christ is the real High Priest, the real Mediator,[33] with whom Aaron cannot compare. And as great as is the difference between the blood of Christ and that of animals, so sharply must one distinguish between

---

24. Calvin also saw the fulfilment of the Old Testament Sabbath in the Eternal Rest of the next life, not in the Christian Lord's Day.
25. T E 250A
26. T E 53B
27. T E 133A
28. T E 133B
29. T E 135A, V 201
30. T E 134A,B
31. T E 135B
32. The word *wesentlich* is used repeatedly and is difficult to translate. Marpeck himself comments on his use of the term in the Introduction to the Testament Explanation, p. IV, A,B, reprinted in Q & F, p. 582.
33. T E 138A

the New and the Old Covenants.[34] The Old Covenant involved material rewards and only a promise of real spiritual blessings. The New Covenant is immeasurably better, having the gift of the Holy Spirit, genuine redemption and eternal forgiveness of sins.[35] As regards the Old Covenant, as little as the Man Christ was there, so little was it a real Covenant of grace and blessing.[36] The Brethren lived under the New Testament, "The law of Christ" (Gal. 6:2), and held that whatever of the Old Testament is obligatory for the Christian is also taught in the New Testament Scriptures.[37] Through this Biblical understanding of the Covenants the Brethren often used language which the prominent Reformers considered heretical. Marpeck spoke of the Law of Moses as having been done away and ended for us through faith in Christ.[38] In a letter to Farel, dated January 21, 1546,[39] Calvin tells of an interview with an Anabaptist who had been arrested for his heretical belief that the Old Testament had been annulled. Calvin's covenant theology, which he adopted from Zwingli and Bullinger, was of a different nature from that of Marpeck and the Anabaptists.

According to Professor Gottlob Schrenk, of the University of Zurich, it was Zwingli who introduced the covenant concept into Reformed theology. And Zwingli was apparently led to this formulation by his struggle with the Anabaptists and his determination to form a state church.[40] The Anabaptists called themselves Brethren of the Covenant and considered themselves to be sealed with baptism which was the sign of the covenant. Baptism was for them a covenant.[41] Zwingli and certain of his followers then developed a counter-formulation of covenant theology, teaching that God made covenants with Adam and the Old Testament patriarchs, giving Abraham circumcision as the seal of the covenant. With this the Brethren agreed. The distinguishing feature however with Zwingli was that he regarded the two covenants as essentially one. "Abraham participated in the one, eternal covenant, for he saw the day

34. T E 138B
35. T E 137B
36. T E 138A
37. See Horsch: *loc. cit.*, V, I, p. 21; also the articles *Bibel* and *Bergpredigt* in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* Bd. I.
38. T E 332A
39. *Menn. Lex.* I, p. 316.
40. *Gottesreich und Bund im älteren Protestantismus, vornemlich bei Johannes Coccejus.* Gütersloh [Germany], 1923, p. 36.
41. *Ibid.,* p. 37, cf. T B 231, 237

of Christ and rejoiced."[42] Essentially, God made only one covenant with mankind,[42] unfolding it by stages. God has one people only, said Zwingli.[42] Our faith and Abraham's is a unit.[42] The New Covenant is but the further unfolding of the Old. The Lord's Supper stands in the same relation to the Passover as infant baptism to circumcision.[43] The Old Covenant included children, who also received the seal of the covenant. And since God made essentially only one covenant, therefore children should be sealed with the present sign of the covenant. Bullinger further developed this Zwinglian theology and Calvin adopted Bullinger's formulation.

Reformed theology, therefore, held a view of the Old Covenant and the Old Testament Scriptures entirely different from that of Marpeck and his brethren.[44] Zwingli's consequent emphasis on the essential unity of the Covenants, as opposed to the Anabaptist emphasis on the fulfilment of the Old by the New, led him to justify the establishment of a state church and the compulsory baptism of all infants in the state.[44a] The result was the execution of godly believers such as Felix Manz who was drowned in the Limmat river in Zurich for advocating believers' baptism and the establishment of a free church. The leading Reformers failed to distinguish the ethics of the New Testament from those of the Old Testament theocracy. So when they read that "Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal" (I Sam. 15:33), they concluded that war and capital punishment were allowable for the followers of Christ as well. It is to be noted that all ethical standards are grounded in theology. Thus with the Reformers there was obviously not the least thought of religious toleration.

The covenant theology of the Swiss Brethren, on the contrary, embraced a much higher ethic for the Christian than that found in the Mosaic code. Indeed, one may say that the distinguishing features of Anabaptist theology spring from a better understanding of the relation of the Covenants than that found with the more prominent Reformers. The question of religious toleration is a case in point. The Brethren held that no force may be employed by the

42. *Ibid.*, p. 38

43. *Ibid.*, p. 39

44. Again note John Horsch's collection of the statements made by Swiss Brethren on this point, *loc. cit.*, V. 1, pp. 22, 23. Luther's position is treated (by Horsch) in footnote 125.

44a. One's view of predestination and of original sin is also involved in the question of infant baptism.

Christian for the accomplishment of anything, be the end ever so good. This position was based on the New Testament Scriptures, the Sermon on the Mount, for example, but no less on certain other passages (Romans 12:19, 20, 21; I Peter 3:9, etc.). Marpeck saw in the abolition of this distinction between Old and New Testament ethics the most awful consequences, such as the Peasant's Revolt (1525), Zwingli's tragic end on the battlefield (1531), and the horrible Münster excesses (1534-1535)—all in the name of Jesus Christ and Christianity.[45] The cross of Christ which the Christian should bear in tribulation was displaced by the Old Testament sword.[45] Marpeck therefore criticized the pope, Luther, Zwingli, and the "false Anabaptists" alike, for following the Scriptures only in part. This was the very criticism which the other Reformers heaped on Marpeck and his brethren. The Brethren stood for a free church and for thorough-going nonresistance, which of course definitely included religious toleration. After quoting a number of verses from the New Testament Marpeck wrote:[46]

> Here the one part says, that no one (run the quoted verses) should punish or chastise with death or other Mosaic punishment in the Christian Church, as was formerly practised in the Law with the external Mosaic sword and the power of the same, but alone with the Word of God as the Sword of the Spirit, and with the ban and exclusion,—as Christ and His apostles first instituted and commanded in the New Covenant (today), and the Apostles themselves through the working of the Holy Spirit (formerly promised and now poured out) profitably used; which Holy Spirit then is today (John 16 ut supra) the proper Disciplinarian for unbelief. . . .

Summing up this section, we note that the Brethren were thoroughly orthodox in their view of the Scriptures. Their consistent recognition of the principle of progressive revelation, and of the fulfilment of the Old Covenant in the New, constituted their distinguishing theological characteristic. Their faith and their way of life were grounded in the New Testament of their Lord and Master, and for that faith and that way of life they were willing to be

45. V 324. The Anabaptist view of the Old Testament had no unfavorable consequences, while the view of the Bible taken by Zwingli and others led to "religious" wars and the persecution of religious dissenters. A free church, nonresistance and toleration are not wholly unrelated.

Cf. here Dirk Philips (d. 1568) and his remarks on the use of the Old Testament by Muensterites and Batenburgers. Quoted by Horsch, *loc. cit.*, V. 1, p. 23.

46. T E 319B. Cf. John Horsch: *loc. cit.*, V, 4, pp. 256 ff.: "Liberty of Conscience."

counted as "sheep for the slaughter,"[47] for they were "companions in the tribulation which is in Christ."[48]

2. *Theology, The Doctrine of God*

In reading the writings of Marpeck one finds an abundance of Scriptural quotation. His faith was emphatically Biblical. He never wrote a textbook in systematic theology. Consequently when one attempts to formulate Marpeck's doctrine of God, he finds chiefly a grand array of Scripture texts. He writes repeatedly that God is a Spirit;[1] that He is Almighty,[2] and that He is all-seeing.[3] To use an anthropomorphism, He possesses in divine form all the good virtues, as love, faithfulness, wisdom, knowledge, goodness, etc.[4] Marpeck fills several pages with a collection of anthropomorphic expressions, referring to the elevation of God (that is, "high" in heaven), and to His eyes, ears, mouth, hand, arm, finger, heart and soul, so that he almost seems to think of God as possessing these organs. Yet, after comparing Matthew 12:28 with Luke 11:20 he remarks: "Therefore the finger of God is identical with the Spirit of God,"[5] clearly evincing a correct understanding of these expressions.[6] In his original state Adam reflected God's character, says Marpeck.[7] If there is anything at this point distinctive in Marpeck's doctrine of God it would be that he perhaps fails to allow his understanding of God's omnipresence (through His Holy Spirit) to make altogether meaningless those passages which speak of God as spatially located (in heaven)[8] even as Christ is. For the body of Christ, since His resurrection, is not "spiritual" in the sense that He is ubiquitous. He is spatially located, "in one place,"[9] namely at the right hand of God the Father.[10] Therefore Father

47. Romans 8:36.

48. The T B concludes: "The Christian believers of the Covenant and of the tribulation which is in Christ." Marpeck concluded his 1544 letter to Schwenckfeld: "A fellow-witness of the truth and of the tribulation which is in Christ." The latter phrase is similar to John's self-designation in Rev. 1:9.

1. V 495, 508
2. V 493
3. V 494
4. V 495 f.
5. V 495
6. Cf. V 508
7. V 496
8. V 506
9. V 476 501 504 f.
10. V 483 T B 233

and Son come to us, (one may say) as one God, through their Holy Spirit.[11]

The most distinctive viewpoint held by the Brethren in the doctrine of God involved the understanding of God's love and grace. They denied the doctrine of predestination as taught by the leading Reformers.[12] The Bible itself, however, speaks repeatedly of God's elect, and the Brethren did not hesitate to do the same. Marpeck speaks of "all the elect of God"[13] and in the *Testament Explanation,*[14] he assembled about two dozen verses mentioning the elect, but offered no comment on them. Valentine Werner, a young collaborator of Marpeck in the preparation of the *Vindication,* wrote to Leopold Scharnschlager on August 26, 1559.[15] Scharnschlager was perhaps second only to Pilgram in the preparation of the *Vindication,* and Werner addresses him as his "father in the Lord." In the course of his letter Werner speaks of God having "gathered us into the number of His elect." Such expressions are thoroughly Biblical. But to formulate these Biblical expressions into a philosophical doctrine of double predestination is another matter and would doubtless result in the preaching of a very unbiblical message. On November 26, 1533, an Anabaptist named Cornelius Poldermann wrote a letter to the Strasburg Municipal Council in which he said that Butzer had the right name, for he had extinguished ("usgebutzt") the Light of the Gospel in Strasburg.[16] On December 3 he was given the opportunity to explain this accusation. He explained that he made the charge "because Butzer taught that God had foreordained certain men [only] to salvation," which was a "frightful gospel."[17] Similarly, Marpeck called the current doctrine of predestination "blasphemous,"[18] although he acknowledged, of course, the providence of God.[19] And while he did not deny a Biblical doctrine of predestination, yet for him the important mat-

---

11. V 515
12. Cf. John Horsch: *loc. cit.,* V. 2, p. 140 ff.
13. V 563
14. T E 218 A,B
15. The letter was published by J. ten Doornkaat Koolman (1889-), formerly a Mennonite and now a Swiss Reformed pastor, in *Zwingliana. Mitteilungen zur Geschichte Zwinglis und der Reformation.* Zürich, 1926, Nr. 1 (Bd. IV, Nr. 11) pp. 329 ff.
16. Röhrich: *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie,* Jahrgang 1860. Gotha [Germany] p. 97.
17. *Ibid.,* p. 73
18. Cf. John Horsch: *loc. cit.,* V, 2, p. 145.
19. T B 233

ter was faith on the part of men.[20] It is not profitable, says Marpeck, for us to discuss how God's foresight, foreordination, secret counsel or foreknowledge arose or stands; but "how it stands" with us,[21] that is our concern. The question arises as to what use Marpeck made of Romans 9. Marpeck saw in this chapter the nations of Israel and Edom (Esau).[22] God's "hating" of the Edomites was due to their, as yet, uncommitted wickedness. That is, he recognized God's predestination to be grounded in His foreknowledge.[22] As examples he cited Isaiah 48:8 and Genesis 16:12.[22] No one has a right to assume that all children are future "Israelites" and proceed to baptize them.[23] As a matter of observation the greater part of mankind turns out to be "Edomites" or "Ishmaelites" in their sinful living. But through the unscriptural practice of infant baptism sinners, although unconcerned and unrepentant, are held to be Christians, for they were baptized.[24]

Marpeck gives a very important place to the work of the Holy Spirit, for He is the One who applies redemption to the individual soul, accomplishing the new birth.[25] In the Holy Spirit we have pardon and forgiveness of sins.[26] He is active in the Christian's conscience, purifying the heart.[27] He strengthens God's people.[28] He is the Comforter.[29] He is "the One who guides into all truth."[30] (This is perhaps Marpeck's favorite expression.) He is the Spirit of love and patience.[31] He personally dwells in the believer.[32]

The late Catholic scholar, Stanislaus von Dunin Borkowski, S. J., (1864-1934), advanced the thesis that Marpeck was "in a certain sense" a Unitarian.[33] Many of Marpeck's utterances cannot be harmonized with this view, however, so von Dunin Borkowski explained that he "sought to conceal" his heresy.[34] The idea that Anabaptists

---

20. Cf. T E 401 A,B
21. Cf. T E 401B
22. V 199, 271
23. V 199 f.
24. Cf. V 200; T B 221
25. V 77 435
26. T B 235
27. T B 202
28. V 179
29. V 343
30. V 363
31. V 393
32. V 440, 492
33. 75 *Jahre Stella Matutina.* Festschrift Band II. Feldkirch [Austria] 1931. "Untersuchungen zum Schrifttum der Unitarier vor Faustus Socini," pp. 103-147. Marpeck is treated pp. 110-112.
34. *Ibid.,* p. 110.

and Mennonites were not sound as regarding the Trinity,[35] or that they held peculiar views of the Trinity (a view published even by an American Mennonite fifty years ago[36]), is a very old one. John Horsch recently presented a brief treatment of this subject,[37] so I will confine my attention to Marpeck.

At this point it is well to remind ourselves again that Marpeck was not a trained theologian. He did not understand the theological distinction between the ontological and economical Trinity. But he did have an amazing acquaintance with the Bible, and to the Bible he wished to be true. If on occasion he employed inaccurate or misleading expressions it was because he went beyond his depth. These expressions do not brand him as a heretic but are rather excrescences in his thinking. They were not fundamental in his theology.

The New Testament writers themselves do not use the word "Trinity." And frequently they too use language which could be construed as not clearly distinguishing between the Persons of the Godhead. It is no cause for wonder, then, if Marpeck does likewise. He speaks, for example, of "the Holy Spirit who is God Himself."[38] Again, of "the promised Holy Spirit, who is Christ the Lord Himself."[39] Marpeck quotes II Corinthians 3:17 several times: "Now the Lord is that Spirit."[40] Both the Greek and the German, however, read: "Now the Lord is the Spirit." And Marpeck is but Pauline when he refers to Christ dwelling in believers through His Holy Spirit.[41] He also calls the Holy Spirit Christ's divine nature.[42] He seems to use the word "name" to signify, person. He says it is necessary, as well as comforting, for Christians to have a fundamental knowledge, that is, to believe in one eternal God, in three Persons or Names, God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, but one in Essence.[43]

It is rather disappointing to find that von Dunin Borkowski fails completely to make an objective study of Marpeck. Here are two

35. Dr. Cornelius van Til of Philadelphia recently advanced the idea that Arminians usually hold a "low view" of the Trinity. *The Presbyterian Guardian,* December 1937, pp. 209 f.
36. Daniel K. Cassel: *History of the Mennonites,* Philadelphia, 1888, p. 426.
37. *Loc. cit.,* V, 1, pp. 24-27.
38. V 528
39. V 235
40. V 436 465 486
41. V 486
42. V 482 485 508
43. V 551

examples: He falsely accuses Pilgram of denying personal distinctions between God and His Spirit and Word,[44] and cites a passage in the *Vindication*[45] as proof. In the passage cited, Marpeck refers to the *Testament Explanation,* stating that the Holy Spirit of the New Testament is the same as that of the Old, just as the same God ruled under both Covenants. Nevertheless, he says, one must distinguish sharply between His activity then and now. So also must one distinguish between the working of God's Word then and now.[46] The reference is totally irrelevant to the question of the Trinity. Again von Dunin Borkowski represents Marpeck as holding that Christ was God only by a "transference of Power" from the Father.[47] This phrase is indeed found on page 418 of the *Vindication,* but in a quotation from Schwenckfeld which Marpeck had copied for the purpose of refutation! The phrase used by Marpeck on page 498 (the reference given by von Dunin Borkowski) is but an allusion to Acts 2:30-36, Ephesians 1:22 and similar Scriptures.[48] In the one case, then, the Catholic scholar failed to understand the grammatical construction of a sentence and so placed an erroneous interpretation upon Marpeck's statement. In the other instance he completely misrepresented Marpeck's thought. Pilgram would have called von Dunin Borkowski's effort, *jesuitische Spitzfindigkeit.*

Marpeck's Christology will be dealt with in the next section, hence it remains here only to complete the discussion of his view of the Person of the Holy Spirit and to examine his utterances on the Trinity. One can but state again that Marpeck clearly speaks of the Holy Spirit in personal terms. For him the Holy Spirit is a Person. In opposing Schwenckfeld's mystical view of a ubiquitous Christ, Marpeck argued that Christ did not promise in John 16:7ff. to return in person to comfort them, but that He would send the Holy Spirit. So neither "sending" and "coming one's self," nor "the One sending" and "the One sent," are identical.[49] In reply to Schwenckfeld's charge of unorthodoxy regarding the Holy Spirit's office etc.,[50] the Brethren replied that it is easy to make accusations,

44. *Op. cit.,* p. 111.
45. V 296
46. Here von Dunin Borkowski failed to grasp the grammar of Marpeck's sentence. The phrase "aber in der wirkung weit underschidlich" refers to the Holy Spirit's activity "yesterday" and in the present. It has absolutely nothing to do with the relation of the Holy Spirit to God the Father.
47. *Loc. cit.,* p. 110. He cites V 498.
48. Cf. V 381
49. V 502
50. V 387, 393

but proving them is another matter.[51] The Holy Spirit they recognized as "The Third Person of the Godhead."[52] He was sent by the Father, in the name of Christ.[53] He is the Comforter.[53] And we are not the Lord's unless we have the Holy Spirit.[54] The Holy Spirit sheds Christian love into the hearts of Christian believers.[55] Marpeck's doctrine of the Holy Spirit is Biblical.

No less clearly do the Brethren attest to their faith in the Holy Trinity, a mystery, be it remarked in passing, to the reason. Baptism, writes Marpeck, shall be in the name of the Holy Trinity.[56] The Three Persons are one God.[57] Marpeck speaks of the unity of God,[58] and of the unity of the Trinity.[59] Where there is genuine faith in Christ, as God's work in the heart, there dwell God, Christ and the Holy Spirit.[60] The Brethren testify to their belief in the Holy Trinity and quote with approval from Schwenckfeld's writings, of which the following is an extract:[61]

> We believe that there is one God and one divine Essence, but in the same divine Essence three independent (separate) Persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; that all three are one God and that each Person possesses in Himself, undivided, the fulness of the divine Essence, which is also common to all three. It is our Christian faith that there are not three Gods, but only one God in three Persons and that each Holy Person in the Godhead, the Son as well as the Father, and the Holy Spirit as well as the Son, is God in Essence, of like power, might, honor, glory and splendor.

This was the faith of the Swiss Brethren. "For there are three," they quoted, "that bear record in heaven: the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."[62] "And that is the Holy Trinity."[63]

3. *Christology*

Pilgram was fond of the expression "Christ the Man" or "the Man Christ Jesus." Von Dunin Borkowski points out that Marpeck

51. Cf. V 394
52. V 394
53. V 431
54. V 436
55. V 441
56. T B 200 228
57. V 110 127
58. V 429
59. V 485 535
60. V 452
61. V 551
62. I John 5:7
63. V 550

was always emphasizing the phrase, "Man Christ."[1] And when Schwenckfeld copied an extract from the *Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper*[2] in which the expression "Christ the Man" was used, he added parenthetically, "Note what is concealed there, when they speak of Christ the man."[3] The Brethren protested at once pronouncing the implied charge of unsound Christology untrue, and insisting that nothing of the kind was meant.[4] It is true that Marpeck had in mind something very definite when he spoke repeatedly of Christ the Man. He was placing emphasis on the fact that Christ was truly human with a natural body.[5] Anyone denying the true humanity of Christ, said Pilgram, is an antichrist.[6] At the same time Marpeck insisted that he was free from Patripassianism.[7] The Man Jesus is the promised Christ (Messiah).[8] He is true God and true man.[9] Hence Marpeck calls Him over and over again "The Lord."[10] One has the feeling that either von Dunin Borkowski did not read the *Vindication* for himself or that he was perhaps not desirous of making an objective study of Marpeck's Christology. We shall therefore let Marpeck himself state what he believes concerning "The Lord, the Man Jesus Christ."[11]

Marpeck and the Brethren clearly speak of Christ's existence before His incarnation, as He formerly was apart from His humanity.[12] All things were created through Him.[13] Yea, He was with the Father before the world was.[14] "All things were created through Him, that are in heaven and earth, visible and invisible," etc.[15] "In this statement, however, Paul does not refer to Christ in His divine-human state," says Marpeck, "but as He formerly was apart from His humanity. Otherwise, if Paul would mean Christ as He now has been revealed, the conclusion would have to follow that Christ has first since [His incarnation] created all things, and was not

1. *Op. cit.*, p. 110.
2. T B 208
3. V 142
4. V 143
5. T B 262
6. V 145
7. V 127 f.
8. V 369
9. V 510
10. Opening the *Vindication* at random I note p. 514, e. g.
11. V 506
12. V 354 f.
13. V 368
14. V 535
15. Col. 1:16

Creator and God [before His incarnation]!"[16] "Christ was indeed formerly and from eternity true God, but His humanity was not yet 'born'."[17]

As to the central article in the faith of the Christian Church, the incarnation of Christ, the Brethren were sound. It is particularly refreshing to find that they escaped the interpretation of the incarnation which Melchior Hofmann and even Menno Simons in part taught. Marpeck speaks of "Melchior Hofmann's error,"[18] in this connection. According to the flesh Christ is of the "creaturely" body of the Virgin Mary, and possesses our human flesh and nature.[18] Although He was without beginning and from eternity was God, yet He became flesh, not as a new creation of flesh, but was born of Mary.[19] And just as the first Adam had no father except God so the Man Christ as the second or true Adam had no other father for his birth and incarnation except God alone.[20] God prepared His body and flesh through His holy, divine supernatural working.[20] Therefore through this new special work of God the Father from His nature and Being, He was born of the highly-graced and blessed Virgin Mary through the power of the Holy Spirit.[20] All sexual desire was absent when Christ was conceived through a divine, new activity and without sin, and born without sin.[20] Therefore Christ's flesh is to be sharply distinguished from ours, for from the first moment on, we live under the curse or threat of physical death, and from the time when the knowledge of good and evil arrives we may sin and suffer eternal death.[20] But Christ was free of all this because of His supernatural birth and divine nature and therefore could not sin or be subject to eternal death.[20] He was wholly clear of original sin,[21] as well as of any committed sinful acts. Christ never sinned and He could not sin.[22] Therefore He did not have to die, but did so gladly out of love for mankind.[23] Thus in emphasizing Christ's sinless nature and His divinity, Marpeck and his collaborators denied the possibility of His sinning. Marpeck however had written a treatise on the possibility of sin in the life

16. T E 279 B
17. T E 402 A
18. V 540. Note that in the catalog of heresies, V 185, it is mentioned, "that Christ had a *luftleib*", i. e., that He didn't have a real body.
19. V 542 f.
20. V 542
21. V 542 543
22. V 543
23. V 543

of Christ[23a] and in this he drew a comparison between Christ's nature and that of Adam before the fall. Both, he said, were free. But Adam chose to rebel against his Maker, while Christ triumphed over all temptation. Schwenckfeld was much dissatisfied with Marpeck's position and said it was dishonoring to Christ to compare Him with Adam.[24]

It is not wholly clear what Marpeck's position really was. The possibilities before us are: 1. That Marpeck in the sense just mentioned allowed for the theoretical possibility of sin in the human Jesus, while believing in the sense of the treatment in the latter part of the *Vindication,* that Christ, the eternal Son of God, could not sin. 2. That Marpeck's collaborators refused to permit him to express his views on this point in the *Vindication.* This theory seems rather doubtful. 3. That Schwenckfeld was honestly or otherwise mistaken as to Marpeck's true position. Two things are certain: Schwenckfeld was a mystic and preached a one-sided Christology.[25] And, as far as we can depend on Marpeck's extant works, he taught clearly that Christ could not sin.

Part of the conflict between the Brethren and Schwenckfeld revolved about the question whether Christ could properly be called a creature. To this question Marpeck and his friends devoted the fifth section of the ninety-sixth chapter of the reply to Schwenckfeld. Schwenckfeld felt that the term cannot properly be applied to One who is at the same time the Second Person in the Trinity. Marpeck urged that the New Testament teaches that at the *Parousia* we shall be "like Him"; and since we are, and will remain, creatures, one may also apply the term to the glorified Christ.[26] Christ is the "firstborn among many brethren."[27] We are the branches on the true vine, Christ.[28] As is usual in controversy the opponents' arguments did not always meet squarely. Both sides advanced arguments which were only partly pertinent. However, if the text of line 30 on page 534 of the *Vindication* be accepted as the true reading, Marpeck had a very precise and orthodox meaning when he spoke of Christ as a creature; he meant that since the incarnation Christ had, and

23a. See *The Mennonite Quarterly Review,* XII, 3 (July, 1938), pp. 159f., 164. This treatise is no longer extant.
24. See *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum,* Vol. VIII, pp. 275 ff.
25. Cf. V 160.
26. V 532
27. V 531 (Rom. 8:29)
28. V 533

always will have, a human nature. Here Marpeck himself gives us the key to the proper understanding of all these statements.

As we saw above, the Brethren believed in the Trinity and held a sound view of the incarnation.[29] Christ lived a perfect life, is therefore our pattern, and died on the cross to make true and eternal atonement for the sins of mankind, to become the mediator of the New Testament.[30] The risen Christ then ascended into heaven and is now at the right hand of the Father. Christ in His full personality and in both natures is equal with the Father, one with Him in essence, power, honor and glory.[31] The glorified Lord, the Man Christ Jesus, is in both unified natures true God . . . yet the natures are to be distinguished.[32] Christ in glory now is to be distinguished from our Lord on earth; He has done away with human weaknesses, mortality, etc.[33] He is the Second Person in the unity of the Trinity.[34] Yet He still is a Man,[35] (still has a human nature) and has a glorified human body—for we shall be like Him in our resurrection bodies. It is no small comfort to mankind to know that Christ who is in heaven, sitting at the right hand of God, and reigning in glory, has human flesh and is a mediator, our High Priest and Advocate.[36] And even if we refuse to drop the word creature (human nature) in referring to Christ we worship Him as God's Son, as our Lord and Redeemer.[37] The whole Man Christ, in the fulness of His Person, is now God and Deity.[38] In His divine nature and in the "creaturely" human flesh He is God.[39] Schwenckfeld admitted that a number of Church Fathers called Christ a creature, "but not in the sense of these teachers."[40] The Brethren felt, however, that the Church Fathers taught that Christ was a creature just as they did: that is, on the foundation of the Holy Scriptures.[41] They did not hold Christ to be *merely* a man, but as true God, with both a human and a divine nature. And they did not believe the

29. T B 262
30. T B 194, V 386, T E 48A,B
31. V 515
32. V 516
33. V 534 f.
34. V 535
35. V 535
36. V 536
37. V 537
38. V 538
39. V 539 f. 541
40. V 547
41. V 547. See Col. 1:15, Rom. 8:29; the Brethren also considered II Cor. 5:17 as substantiating their viewpoint.

human nature could be denied any more than the divine.[42] "We have given enough testimony concerning the Deity of the whole [Person] Jesus Christ and that He is to be worshipped as God," they said. They were sure they had made clear their meaning and that no one could interpret it falsely.[43]

Then again Marpeck employs expressions which must be interpreted in the light of the preceding discussion. For example, he speaks of Christ as the first Son of God in truth and love,[44] anointed from God above His fellows.[45] Similarly, the incarnated Word was the first "Christian" of God, for before the incarnation there were no Christians.[46] Here Marpeck speaks of Christ's human nature in a radical sense, and opens himself to grave misunderstanding. Yet his repeated assertions of Christ's Deity should prevent one's misunderstanding even such rather unfortunate expressions. And he himself stated both in the *Vindication*[47] and in the *Testament Explanation*[48] that in the use of such a word as "Son," Christ's humanity dare not be separated from His Deity. And in the former book he adds that in past years the Brethren had contended for an orthodox Christology against a number of people who opposed the teaching that the glorified Christ with His two united natures was God Almighty.[48a]

The Scripture calls Christ the Word of God, the revelation of God the Father. Marpeck does likewise.[49] He stresses the function of the Word of God in regeneration. But this will be discussed below. Here we may note only the several senses in which Marpeck speaks of the Word. "The glorified Lord, the Man Jesus Christ, with His two natures, dwells in heaven and speaks the Word through His Holy Spirit . . . in the inner ear of the believers' hearts as a living Word of God, which Word and Spirit then are God and Christ Himself."[50] Marpeck also employs the well-known Reformation term, "external Word," for the preaching of the Gospel.[51] The

42. V 553
43. V 549
44. Citing II John [3]
45. Heb. 1:9. Cited in T E 239, 245 etc.
46. V 311. Marpeck has Schwenckfeld in mind here.
47. T E 100A
48. V 507
48a. V 507. See the "Additional Note" in this number of *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, p. 269 for a possible identification.
49. See V 517 ff. On p. 298 of V, Marpeck compares Christ and His Word to the sun and its rays, adding that they are one.
50. V 516
51. V 518 ff.

action of the Holy Spirit, however, in the hearts of believers, and the expression "external Word," must be understood for what they were intended. Marpeck's doctrine of the Word of God—be it in the sense of the Second Person of the Trinity, of the Holy Scriptures or of the Power of the Gospel—is orthodox. He refused to separate living Spirit from dead letter in the Scriptures. In this sense (contra Schwenckfeld, Denck *et al*) Marpeck insisted that there was but one Word of God, just as there was but one baptism which included the inner renewal and the outer ceremony with water.[52]

Finally, the Brethren regarded Christ as the King foretold by the Old Testament prophets. Christ fulfilled Numbers 24. He was the Star arising out of Jacob.[53] Other Scriptures which they regarded as fulfilled in Christ were Psalms 2, 24, 45, 47, 93; Isaiah 32, Ezekiel 37, Micah 2, 4, Daniel 7,[54] Zech. 9, 14, Luke 1, Psalms 89, 61, Isaiah 52, Daniel 2, Ezekiel 34, etc.[55] "Here it says that Christ the Man in the Name of God the Lord and Father was a King. John 12 ut supra. Also Psalm 118, Matthew 21, Mark 11, and John 5 . . . ."[55] This viewpoint was shared by Menno Simons and his followers. They believed that the Kingdom of Peace foretold by the Old Testament, and the Kingdom announced at the birth of Christ and at the beginning of His ministry, was none other than the present spiritual Kingdom in which all believers participate. This Kingdom was pre-eminently one of peace and this understanding of the Kingdom is a mainstay of the doctrine of nonresistance. Marpeck quotes Old Testament passages at length and sees them fulfilled in Christ, although he perhaps applies some to the eternal state.[56]

The Brethren could well sum up their attitude toward their Lord in the words of Revelation 5:12, 13: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing . . . . Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."[56]

52. V 527
53. T E 334 B
54. T E 335 A
55. T E 335 B
56. V 536

4. *Anthropology*

A monograph on Marpeck's anthropology has already appeared in *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*[1], although based solely on the *Vindication,* hence it will not be necessary to treat the subject at great length. Marpeck referred quite often to the Fall, but not very frequently to the original state, before the Fall. He states, however, that before the Fall Adam was a good, upright creature or creation of God.[2] He possessed the divine image, a reflection of God's character. In his original state man was characterized by love, faithfulness, understanding, wisdom, knowledge, piety, goodness and similar virtues; and this through the divine inbreathing.[3] The first man was immortal before the Fall.[4]

Then came man's awful transgression, and this through his own free choice. It is blasphemous to assert that Adam had to fall,[4] as if God were responsible; that idea is contrary to the Scripture which says that God saw all that He had made and behold it was very good.[5] The Fall was followed by death and the divine wrath. These had their beginning in one man.[6] More particularly, the Fall was followed by death and earthly tribulation.[7] These were the direct consequences of the Fall. Yet Marpeck separated them in the following manner. God is not the author of sin and death. Therefore He did not directly visit death upon mankind. Adam became mortal when he ate of the fruit, continues this rather doubtful argument, and that was before God's pronouncement of sentence upon the transgressors. Out of His love and faithfulness God had before *warned* Adam that death would result from the eating of the forbidden fruit.[8] Marpeck supports his argument by an analogy with the tree of life. The tree of life bore that name because the eating thereof communicated eternal life.[9] Similarly the tree of the knowledge of good and evil bore fruit, the eating of which resulted in death; this is equivalent to calling it the tree of death.[10] The eating of this mortal fruit infected mankind with original sin, and

1. Dr. Horst Quiring, "The Anthropology of Pilgram Marbeck," in the October, 1935, number.
2. V 553
3. V 496
4. T E 112 A
5. V 191
6. V 130
7. V 251 f.
8. V 251, 255 f.
9. V 252 f.
10. V 252, 258

death is the fruit of original sin, not a specially-added divine visitation.[11] And when Marpeck speaks of death, he means all that is called death, be it temporal (physical) death or eternal death.[12] When God warned Adam of death following transgression, the word death had this double import.[12] Marpeck paraphrases Gen. 3:19 to read that God punished Adam with temporal tribulation, and implied in His reference to the return of the body to dust that Adam's eating of the forbidden fruit had infected him with physical death, in accordance with the divine warning.[12] Marpeck's exegesis was a labored effort to escape the conclusion that God was the author of death for mankind.

What is sin? Primarily it is disobedience to God's commandment,[13] which is equivalent to a revolt of the creature against his Creator. This is Marpeck's consistent conception of sin. It does not follow, however, that he diluted his view of sin to mean only overt, individual, acts. He recognized two facts as against this view: first the solidarity of the human family, who all sinned in Adam (Rom. 5),[14] and second, that sin cannot be confined to overt acts, but is in our natures. The lust and desire of the sinful nature are followed by the overt transgression.[15] Both are sin. The Brethren recognized only one transgression, with its inner and outer aspects.[16]

What is original sin? Before setting forth their own view on this point the Brethren stated two ancient interpretations of the doctrine and sharply opposed them. The first saw original sin in the marital relation.[17] The Brethren quoted Luther in opposing this ascetic and unbiblical view. The second error is that flesh and blood *per se* are original sin.[18] Marpeck says that by no means is this the case; this would be a reflection on God.[18] Flesh and blood are God's good creation, and only since Adam's fall has the flesh become the dwelling of sin. This erroneous view, added Pilgram, would lead to the further error that the saints will not be clad with this body of flesh in the resurrection.[19]

---

11. V 255
12. V 257
13. T B 215; V 213 (quotes from *Theologia deutsch*)
14. V 256
15. V 261, 217
16. V 261
17. V 190
18. V 191
19. V 192. In V 237 he assigns both sin and unbelief to the understanding, "nit

Having rejected these two mistaken views, the Brethren proceeded to state their own view. Original sin, they said, is the corruption of human nature, introduced by Adam's fall, which is inherited by each generation.[20] At once they added however that infants are not subjects of the divine wrath. It may be noted parenthetically that Marpeck seems to have viewed original sin much as Zwingli did. Zwingli also used the German word "Erbbresten" (Marpeck's usual designation[21]), and saw death, rather than guilt, in Romans 5, as that which is inherited from Adam. Marpeck speaks a number of times of infants being as Adam was before the transgression.[22] Converted adults must become as little children.[23] Yet this state of children compares with the original state only in respect to innocence, i. e., children have no knowledge of good and evil, and are not accountable for their nature. Marpeck excused children from guilt and original sin only through Christ.[24] For not only did all sin in Adam; all likewise received the promise of Christ's sacrificial death.[25] Children are not under the curse of the law.[26] Christ never placed guilt on children,[27] although they have original sin, that is, a corrupt nature.[28] In substantiation of their point the Brethren quoted from a since lost Moravian Anabaptist Confession of Faith, the Sixteen Articles,[29] in which it was stated that before children come to years of understanding they have no sin, for their sinful nature does not destroy their salvation until it breaks forth in the real sin of an accountable agent. Therefore God did not order baptism for infants.[29] With this view the Swiss Brethren were in perfect agreement. Children do have sinful natures. Therefore one hears the expression: Look how the old Adam is striving in him![30] But prior to their coming to accountable understanding God does not reckon this fallen nature as sin (guilt) to their account. As a parallel Marpeck points out that God bore with sinful mankind until

---

in der unvernunft der menschen;" yet this must be understood in the full light of all his statements on the nature of sin.

20. V 193; Cf. 248
21. V 198
22. V 199, T B 216, 246
23. V 194
24. V 197
25. V 203
26. V 206
27. V 211
28. V 266
29. V 268
30. V 198

the Mediator appeared in the course of history. (Rom. 3:25, Acts 17:30).[31]

Are all dying infants then saved? Of one thing the Brethren were sure: that baptism was not intended for infants. Neither would Catholic exorcism help them.[32] No one can drive the fallen nature out of an infant. The Brethren in one passage shrink from stating that all children go to heaven. (For infants cannot repent or believe, and the new birth presupposes an understanding.) In this passage they say we must simply leave the children in the hands of God, in the secret council and judgment of God.[33] They add a gloss: Who can judge the children except God alone? Yet elsewhere Marpeck expresses the confident assurance that innocent children are regarded by God as sinless and if they die they will be saved.[34] This salvation is due only to Christ's mercy, not to the fact that they are the children of believers. Incidentally this was also the reason the Brethren did not baptize infants. Baptism is indeed the seal of the New Covenant, as circumcision was of the Old. But the Old Covenant was a national one and a Jew was born into the congregation of the covenant people. But one enters the New Covenant not by virtue of race as in the Old Covenant, but by virtue of the new birth, of which baptism is the outward sign of cleansing. As Marpeck wrote in the *Testament Explanation:* "Their [the believers'] young children do not inherit faith from them as flesh and blood; and since they can neither speak nor understand, they cannot be considered as belonging to the spiritual seed, as formerly the young children in Israel (according to the flesh) were. But such young children today, without understanding, without speech, children of the flesh, are to be committed to God. . . . Without a doubt if they die . . . God will bring them into His Kingdom to His praise."[35]

Expressions such as "children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3) Marpeck correctly ascribed to the pre-conversion days of the saints, not to infants.[36] David's lament (Psalm 51:5) about his sinful conception

31. V 200. He also held that no one suffered eternal death until the time of Christ (V 277). In common with Zwingli he likewise believed that no one entered heaven until the time of Christ (Schrenk: *op. cit.*, p. 39), V 410. This was partly a remnant of the ancient "Limbus" concept, but also partly due probably to his understanding of the relation of the Covenants to one another and the fact that there was no real forgiveness of sins until the time of Christ (Heb. 10:4).
32. V 280
33. V 272
34. V 280
35. T E 222B
36. V 239

refers to the sinful nature of his parents, not his own state as a foetus and an infant.[37] And Marpeck was not disturbed by Schwenckfeld's analogy of the fox and his fox-nature,[38] where Schwenckfeld insists that the fox has the fox-nature long before he steals chickens. Marpeck replied that this was a deceptive parable. The fox has only one nature, that of a fox. No one can improve it nor convert it into a sheep.[39] Man has two natures, a higher as well as a lower; this is even true of unregenerated persons. They also have a "natural light."[40] Marpeck speaks repeatedly of this "light of nature."[41] Hence one finds noble characters among the heathen, "natural, pious, god-fearing men."[42] As examples he cites Cornelius (Acts 10), Gamaliel, Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus.[43] It might be noted in this connection that even Reformed theology with its doctrine of total depravity also has a doctrine of common grace and would allow for Marpeck's "pious" heathen.

However when speaking of the state of man in regard to his standing before God Marpeck's tone is quite different. The natural, unregenerated, man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God.[44] All men are by nature incapable of understanding divine things.[45] Marpeck even speaks of the fallen man Adam with all his descendants as ruined, helpless and dead.[46] He who refuses the rescue offered by the Saviour will become more sick, and more blind and will die altogether; yea, he is already dead through unbelief.[47] Lost souls are in Satanic bondage.[48] The only entrance to new life which the Brethren knew was through the grace of God.[49] Faith in Christ is God's work,[50] and God's gift.[51] As one grasps the thoroughly Biblical view of man and of sin which the Brethren held, he well understands the ease with which Marpeck could shake off the

37. V 263 f.
38. V 210 ff. Cf. the wolf, pp. 262 ff.
39. V 218
40. V 218
41. V 197, 206, 233, 325
42. T E 231 A, 235A
43. Compare Zwingli, who even spoke of the Greek philosophers as perhaps reaching heaven (through the superabundance of God's grace).
44. V 100
45. T B 275
46. V 312
47. V 461
48. V 232
49. V 85 etc.
50. V 485
51. V 488, T B 239

label of Pelagianism[52] which Schwenckfeld had rashly tacked onto the Anabaptists.

This renewal of the person effected by God's Holy Spirit will be discussed in the section on soteriology which follows. At this point we are interested only briefly in Marpeck's doctrine of the regenerated man. Marpeck used the figure, with the limitations placed upon it by the foregoing considerations, of each human being experiencing for himself a fall from innocence into guilt. Each one of us at one time ate of the forbidden fruit for the first time; we put forth our hand to the tree of knowledge.[53] At that moment accountability and guilt was reckoned to us by God. Apart from the limitations stated above, this illustration would be Pelagian. As it is, it is quite Biblical. Faith, then, through the new birth, amounts to the annulment of Adam's fall.[54] The old Adam must die, and one must be reborn.[55] The first activity of the grace of God in saving a man is to give him a knowledge of sin through the law, and of God's wrath. Sin then becomes mightier and wins "the upper hand." The sick man, repentant, appeals to the Physician Christ and hears His voice of salvation, believes on Him and through the promised Holy Spirit is released from the devil and from prison and bonds, and becomes captive to Christ, henceforth no longer to serve sin and the devil, but Christ, his Purchaser and Redeemer, Whose he is.[56] The regenerated person shall not live after the flesh but shall walk in the Spirit.[57] And there are two kinds of flesh: a pure flesh, dead to sin, and an unclean flesh, which cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.[57] The Christian possesses a renewed flesh; he is a new creature.[58] Yet this optimistic viewpoint is not one-sided; Marpeck recognized that Christians were not perfect. The members of the Anabaptist communion were not a perfect group.[59] Marpeck could even apply Romans 7 to the Christian, stating that sin is not eradicated from the believer's nature; yet he immediately adds that it is powerless and dead and through the grace of Christ is not reckoned

52. V 190, 196 ff., 209, 279
53. T B 242
54. V 216, 275, 380, 385, T E 374 A
55. V 208
56. V 234
57. V 553. Yet Marpeck's meaning here is not perfectly clear. One is not certain whether he is speaking of *Christ's* flesh or the regenerated person's, or both.
58. V 533
59. V 88

to us as guilt.[59a] The emphasis of the Brethren on the power of the Christian, true of course only because of the indwelling Holy Spirit and His renewal of man's nature, to live a life pleasing to God, is one of the most refreshing aspects of the faith of these noble children of God. They were ready both to live in, and to die for, their faith. It is no wonder that their conscience bore them testimony of salvation in the Holy Ghost.[60]

It might well be added at this point that the Brethren did not waste their time discussing whether man was dichotomous or trichotomous. Expressions implying the latter are probably but Scriptural allusions which multiply terms to signify the whole personality.[61]

5. *Soteriology*

As noted in the last section, mankind was in a lost state after Adam's transgression. Eternal life was lost and death passed to all men.[1] It was also pointed out that Marpeck held to the peculiar view that until the time of Christ God suspended judgment on all the dead. No one went to heaven nor was anyone condemned to hell fire, continues Marpeck, until the time of Christ.[2] This conception of a "Limbus" was found in the early history of the Church, and is to be sharply distinguished from any purgatory-concept. The Limbus-belief was introduced into Scholasticism by Thomas Aquinas (1225-74), using Eph. 4:8, I Pet. 3:19, Heb. 9:6-8 and 11:39. With this concept of a waiting-place for the dead was associated the belief that during the interval between his death and resurrection Christ went and preached to these "spirits in prison."[3] This is, for example, the theme of Article IX of the Lutheran Formula of Concord (1577). The chief author of the Formula was Jacob Andreae (1528-90), who also wrote against Marpeck's *Testament Explanation,* as noted in an earlier article.[3a] The Cross was for Marpeck and the Brethren, then, the center of history. All sin prior to Christ's death was not really forgiven,[4] only "winked at." We of today

59a. V 275
60. V 575
61. V 454, 457, 465-7, 476f., 496, 529, 567

1. T E 125B
2. V 410, 202
3. V 317; T E 122 A, B See the articles "Hoellenfahrt Christi," in the Protestant Theological Encyclopoedia: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* II Aufl., Tübingen [Germany], 1929, vol. II, col. 1968; and "Limbus" vol. III, col. 1657 f.
3a. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review,* XII, 3 (July, 1938), pp. 162 ff.
4. Forgiveness under the Old Covenant meant only the cancelling or dimunition

know also of only one remedy for sin: Christ's atonement on Calvary.

The death and the suffering of Christ accomplished atonement and reconciliation between God and men, and the appeasing of God's wrath on account of sin.[5] Christ gave His earthly, natural life and body in death, shedding His blood for the forgiveness of our sins.[6] We have already noted that faith in Christ as the divine Redeemer amounts to an annulment of the Fall. Hence Marpeck can also consistently speak of Christ's annulling the Fall of Adam.[7] But he does not stop with that. He says that Christ annulled the fall *for all men*.[7] Marpeck recognized the solidarity of the human race in sin. He also recognized the solidarity of mankind in redemption. National distinctions are wiped out. God's people were purchased by Christ irrespective of race, both heathen and Jews.[8] Of course this universalism is theoretical. Only believers are saved. But Marpeck knows nothing of a "limited" atonement.[9] Perhaps Marpeck's favorite expression was that Christ despoiled or wrested the power from him who had the power of death[10] (Heb. 2:14), that is, the devil. In other words Christ redeemed mankind from the power of sin. Incidentally Marpeck has little to say of Satan's origin, but it is clear that he regarded him as a fallen creature of God.[11]

God has been reconciled to mankind through the death of His Son; the penalty for sin has been paid. Yet men of themselves would remain unaffected by Christ's death were it not for the divine application of salvation. This brings us to Marpeck's doctrine of the new birth, or regeneration. What expressions does he use? He speaks of the baptism of Jesus Christ as the baptism of the new birth, cleansing and washing from sin and remaining pure.[12] He also speaks of being born again and becoming alive through the

---

of temporal tribulation. T E 2 f. Note, e. g., how many Psalms have to do with physical salvation.

5. T E, 405 A

6. T B 262

7. V 275; cf. 398

8. Cf. T E 214 B

9. V 398, 289. In one case he employs the expression, "Savior of all the elect," but immediately adds, "yea, of all men." V 326.

10. T E 122 A. V 410, 543 etc. The "destroy" of the King James version does not mean to annihilate but to wrest the power from or "annul" (margin).

11. V 212. Other references to Satan, the "old serpent," and the devil: V 62, 79, 103, 133, 152, 171, 192, 212, 232, 250, 263, 290, 568; T B 187.

12. V 71

Holy Spirit;[13] of the new birth;[14] of the spiritual or first resurrection.[15] One may also say that being born again is legally or completely giving of one's self over to and obligating one's self to the will of God.[16] The new birth is a spiritual birth,[17] and it involves the whole person, including flesh and blood.[18] Paul speaks of the taking away of the filthiness of the flesh.[19] Undoubtedly Marpeck and his collaborators in asserting that the new birth included flesh and blood were but emphasizing that regeneration means the renewal of the whole person. Becoming a Christian does not merely mean mental assent to a creed with the privilege of serving sin in the flesh; rather it means a complete cleansing through the Holy Spirit and continuing in a cleansed state by the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts (Gal. 5:24).[20] Everyone must possess his vessel in sanctification and honor (I Thes. 4:4).[20] Baptism signified for Paul the putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ (Col. 2:11).[20] Our bodies were washed with pure water (Heb. 10:22).[21] Marpeck's emphasis was that Christ really did make Satan powerless, that we really are cleansed through and through in regeneration. And although we may not be accustomed to his terminology we must admit that it is a more Biblical emphasis than the modern excuse for indifferent sinning, that "we all have our weakness." It is only necessary to remind ourselves that here as elsewhere, Marpeck remains Biblical, even if it leads him into paradoxical statements. He does not regard the Christian as absolutely perfect,[22] and one must distinguish between our cleansed bodies here and our resurrection bodies.[23] Yea, we wait with sighs for the return of the Lord.[24]

It is the Holy Spirit who applies redemption to us and accomplishes the new birth. When the Holy Spirit touches a heart, there a child of God is born.[25] That is one aspect of the truth. At the same

13. V 77, 241, 251
14. V 113
15. T E 122 A; V 375
16. V 116
17. V 202, T B 204
18. V 283-293
19. T B 203 (II Cor. 7:1)
20. V 286
21. V 285
22. T E 92 B (to be quoted later); V 291
23. V 287, 557
24. V 343
25. T B 199

time faith is very intimately associated with the new birth. Marpeck probably held that the coming of faith and the experience of the new birth were but two ways of stating the same fact. At any rate we shall here note the means which the Holy Spirit uses in bringing faith or the new birth. Marpeck speaks of "the seed of the Word", apart from which children and heirs are not born into the kingdom of God and His Christ.[26] Physical water takes its place beside the "external Word," or the preaching of the gospel of the forgiveness of sins, the death and burial of the old man and the putting on of the new.[27] One is born in the "water-bath of the Word."[28] He who hears and believes the Word of the Gospel is born as a child of God.[29] All men are incapable of understanding divine things and are first brought to a real faith in and a knowledge of Christ through the Word. The Scripture knows no other means.[30] It is filled with the idea that faith comes by the hearing of the Word.[31] The water-bath of the Word cleanses and brings faith, which faith comes through the external preaching of the Word.[32] Faith and the Holy Spirit come through and out of the preaching of the Word.[33] As was noted earlier, the external Word is the preaching of the Gospel. Marpeck therefore speaks of the identity of the preached and the written Word.[34] What happens when a man is born again is that the Holy Spirit fructifies the Word in his heart; he who believes is made alive.[35] Faith is God's gift and grace.[36] Yet grace is not irresistible; the living Word, i. e., the Holy Spirit's application of the Word, accomplishes the new birth if it is not resisted.[36] Marpeck also held that a true preaching or reading of the Word by an unconverted person could be blessed by the Holy Spirit to the good of the hearers.[37] When we preach the Word of God we are preaching the same Word which the Apostles preached. Schwenckfeld is grievously in error when he presents the view that there are two

---

26. T B 238
27. V 110
28. V 134
29. V 297
30. T B 275
31. T B 276
32. V 121
33. V 149, 453
34. V 522, 517 ff.
35. V 519
36. V 523. This is similar to Luther's view although Marpeck held a more orthodox view of the Scriptures than Luther.
37. V 524

Words of God, says Marpeck.[38] The Brethren knew nothing of an "inner Word" in a mystical sense, nor of new revelations.[39] The Holy Spirit has given us this Word in writing.[40] The Word of God is written, but the paper and ink are not Holy Scripture; the Word of God is what is written.[41] It is this one Word of God which brings faith and the new birth to hearers. Marpeck gave the Law an important place in bringing men to a knowledge of sin and conviction.

In the *Testament Explanation* Marpeck drew his usual contrasts between the two Covenants. The Old Testament saints did not experience the new birth; they had no spiritual resurrection.[42] We of today however experience a genuine rebirth, a first resurrection (Rev. 20:5, 6).[42] "Yesterday was the time of remorse and sorrow for sin, of fear of eternal judgment, but without present redemption and real repentance. . . . Today is the time of redemption, of finding, and of eternal forgiveness through present faith in Christ, the coming of which causes sorrowing and weeping for sins to cease. Therefore one shall repent to eternal life from this moment on."[43] "For in Christ one is God's child through present faith, through which one also has the Holy Spirit . . . , and stands under the judgment and discipline of grace, since one does not wilfully sin."[44]

The Holy Spirit brings us faith through the hearing of the Word, and through faith one is God's child. What is faith? First of all Marpeck states what faith is not. It is not a mere historical or "head-faith." Nor is it faith in a dead Christ, who does not live in the heart. This is the so-called faith of worldly or carnal Christians, those who are Christians only in name. Neither is faith a merely historical faith, without fruit, without power and dead. When Marpeck speaks of faith he is thinking of something fruitful, powerful and living.[45] He emphasizes the necessity of genuine faith, —a personal commitment to Christ for salvation, accompanied by a holy life. He and his collaborators knew of no other faith than

38. V 518 ff., 527 ff.
39. Cf. V 145 f., 107 etc. The Bible is the norm of truth.
40. V 527
41. Cf. V 521
42. T E 127 B
43. T E 162 B. This repentance must be preceded by a knowledge of sin and eternal death; the convert must have a burdened conscience and a broken heart, and realize that in himself he is eternally lost. V 481. Compare the beautiful sentence on V 572, lines 20-35. Repentance is a stage only; one shall press on and "seize" salvation, to change the wording.
44. T E 163 B
45. V 495

faith in Christ.[46] Their faith was a simple faith. Human wisdom has no place in the kingdom of Christ nor in matters of faith.[47] Marpeck could be quite stern in dealing with hypocrisy and carnality. He speaks, for example, of carnal teachers and preachers, who may be ever so well instructed in the truths of the Bible (as far as that is possible for the natural man) yet because they do not have the Holy Spirit they do not have a true knowledge of God,[48] i. e., they are lost. At the same time one catches a tender note in Marpeck's treatment of faith as he perhaps thought of Christians who were weak in assurance. "For through [Christian] faith each and every man is a child of God and is no longer a slave under the law, but is released from it and free; whether one is in such faith young, child-like or weak. . . . For Paul does not say through strong faith, nor through weak faith, but simply, through faith in Christ Jesus one is a child of God."[49]

The new birth and faith are followed by new life in Christ. This is not merely a new standing; it results in a holy walk. Every believer is obligated to carry his cross. "Secondly, the Man Christ taught us the way of life that we should no longer live the rest of our time in human lusts but to the will of God. I Pet. 4 [2] ut supra. . . . As concerning the old man from Adam's fall, the old life or living for self, [one must] deny one's self . . . and take up the cross and tribulation (which arises through such renunciation) upon one's self and follow after Christ."[50] The entrance into the new life is very narrow; one cannot enter with the old sinful man of the old life; everything must be stripped off before this door and buried.[51] "He who would follow me must deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me." That shall occur in baptism.[52] "Hear what real and true baptism is, in order that each one may believe for himself; To die to sin, to walk henceforth in a new God-fearing life and therein (until the end of life) to persevere."[53] Those who are really and truly baptized in Christ are baptized with Christ, through patience, as fellow companions of the tribulation of Christ, to suffer with Christ until mortal death. No infant can take this

46. V 96
47. V 99; cf. V 430, 469
48. V 527
49. T E 89 A
50. T E 125 B; Cf. V553
51. T B 211
52. T B 212
53. T B 216

obligation upon himself.[54] Christ demands that we follow Him in the same righteous love.[55] We know of no knowledge of Christ, clarity of claim to eternal life, apart from keeping His commandments and teaching.[56] "Without remaining in which Teacher's teaching, one has no God, any more than all the world, Turks and the heathen have. And he who does not keep such Teacher's teaching, God will search out and destroy. . . ."[57] The "inner circumcision" of "yesterday" was only to sorrowing and weeping for sin; but that of Christ is a circumcision not to sorrowing but to the putting-away of sin.[58] Only by remaining in Christ is one His disciple, and only so does he have a God.[59] Following Christ in His lowliness and humility,[60]—that is our cross. Until released by mortal death we must daily and constantly bear the suffering, tribulation and cross of Christ with patience.[61] The Brethren took the demands of the Word of God for a life of holiness very seriously; Christianity was an intensely serious matter. The world, they said, was full of people who confessed that Christ was God's Son, but who did not live in the obedience of faith; such people are not in the Kingdom.[62] So far was Marpeck removed from any idea of perfectionism however, that in his letter to Helena Streicher he said: "We have no other comfort than to set forth our poverty in all lowliness."[63] The Brethren also recognized the possibility of apostasy, of Satan disturbing the minds of believers in the simplicity of faith.[64]

Sanctification is a progressive process. One shall grow in love, knowledge and the like toward perfection. Such present imperfection in these virtues, however, is to be as sharply distinguished from imperfection before Christ as the believer's former standing is to be separated from our present standing in Christ.[65] Indeed in one place[66] Marpeck speaks of the new birth in the sense of progressive sanctification, as continuing throughout this life. The Christian's

54. T B 218; cf. 224, 244, 281
55. T B 256
56. V 66
57. T E 222 A
58. T E 168 B
59. V 168
60. V 244
61. V 399
62. V 308
63. Q & F 184
64. V 192
65. T E 92 B
66. T B 219

struggle with himself, in spite of his "new flesh," is a life-long one; the Christian must ever strive to live in love.[67]

What is the reborn, justified Christian's relation to law? What is Christian freedom? How does Marpeck deal with this difficult problem? First of all he insists on the Christian's obligation to keep the commandments of Christ. His position probably was that the Christian does not thereby help to earn his salvation; but that if he does not keep Christ's commandments he is a hypocrite and not a Christian. "We teach," he wrote, "only God's teaching and Word, preach not ourselves but Christ, that one shall hear His teaching, voice, speech and word, therein abide . . . , follow after Him, as also Christ and the apostles taught. . . . *How then are we against Christian freedom?*"[68] God's children are free, as the Lord said. One comes to this freedom by abiding in the word of Christ, yea, by the law of the Spirit, by which one is made free from the law of sin and death.[69] When one interprets freedom to mean carnal liberty he will find himself in bondage to the law of sin and death, and not free.[70] In the Streicher letter[71] Marpeck also referred to the legalism with which Paul had to contend—observance of Sabbaths, days, months, circumcision, etc.—as being against the free grace of Christ. All this bondage belonged to the Old Covenant. "It is quite clear that the former servitude of bondage does not cease until today [in the New Covenant] through present faith in Jesus Christ. . . . Since faith came we are no longer under the schoolmaster. As Paul himself further says: For you are all God's children. . . . There he excepts no one, neither weak nor strong, young nor old, but reckons them all together as God's children in Christ, who are free from this servitude; which freedom first began [in the New Covenant] through the present law of the New Testament."[72]

No one could possibly accuse the Brethren of Antinomianism. Indeed the moral demands of the New Testament are more penetrating than those of the more external Mosaic law. Marpeck was therefore done with Moses and his law. Yet not so! For although the letter of the Mosaic law has been done away, yet through the

67. T B 274
68. V 145 (Italics mine).
69. V 152
70. V 153
71. Q & F 185
72. T E 169 A

inner writing of the law in our hearts we for the first time really fulfil the law. For Christ did not come to destroy the law but to fulfil it.[73] We are able to fulfil the law because of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, present faith, and the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.[74] "Therefore one is free from the law of Moses, and therefore today for the first time one rightly fulfils such law . . . through the love shed [into our hearts] today."[75] Marpeck placed the Ten Commandments in a special class, probably as an expression of the eternal law of God. "Everything formerly," he says, "the law and commands for Israel, ceremonies, customs and the Ten Words, were written in stone, and in a book, and together they made sin manifest and caused wrath. But today through faith in Christ, everything falls that does not touch the Ten Words, as ceremony, circumcision, offerings and the like, and there remains only the Ten Words. Yet no longer written on stone tables but in the heart by God . . . and so the law is annulled and not annulled . . . ."[76] This is sound doctrine. Grace is grace. The Christian is not saved by law. In the Old Covenant God told Israel that if they keep His laws He will be their God and they shall be His people. This was legalism. God "took them captive in servitude."[77] In contrast with this Old Testament promise based on such conditions, is present faith in Jesus Christ, "for here there is no difference; all have sinned and come short of the glory which God should have, and are made righteous through His grace without earning it,[77a] through the redemption accomplished by Christ . . . ."[78]

Summing up this teaching on salvation we may say that man was helpless in sin. God provided atonement through Christ's suffering and death. The Holy Spirit applies redemption, bringing the penitent sinner faith and the new birth by means of the Word. The Christian is saved by God's grace but is obligated to keep the law of God. This he is able to do only by the indwelling Spirit of God. He is free from the Mosaic law yet truly fulfils it by keeping the law of the New Covenant. He is saved by grace.

With such a sound soteriology it is but natural that the Brethren

73. T E 145 A, B; 149 A.
74. T E 149 A
75. T E 149 B
76. T E 150 A
77. T E 211 B
77a. Marpeck says, "on [ohne] Verdienst."
78. T B 234

had Christian assurance. "We know, thank God, of the freedom in and through Christ . . . ."[79] "His Holy Spirit . . . will guide us till the end."[80] "He who has reached the above-mentioned narrow door of the one baptism of which we speak, has assurance . . . , he knows Christ not only in heaven in glory but also in his heart to the working of obedience to His commandments, and stands in the true freedom of Christ and not in false freedom."[81] Marpeck could assure only those of salvation who had the assurance of salvation and had been baptized.[82] The Brethren had tasted of the love of God and Christ and knew Their "friendliness," for so reads the German in Psalm 34:8.[83] Incidentally the Brethren were also open to truth.[84]

One cannot refrain from also calling attention to their opinion of the things which they felt followed infant baptism in the Catholic Church: "All kinds of hypocrisy, magic, etc., the blessing and smearing [of infants] with oil, exorcisms, driving out the devil, the application of spittle, giving ashes and salt, and other barbarity."[85] They likewise lamented Catholic masses for the dead.[86]

In conclusion, mention should be made of two points on which the Anabaptists differed from the rest of the Christian world and to which they held because they believed they were included in the "law" of Christ for His followers, namely: The nonswearing of oaths and nonresistance. Of the former Marpeck has little to say. His extant works were on limited themes and he had no occasion to discuss the matter. In one passage he emphasized that an oath should always be true.[87] Yet, a page or so later he makes a distinction "between the oath of human disputes and the oath of divine and Christian, holy things; between God and men we know quite well that the oath of human disputes does not belong to Christian ethics (*handlung*)."[88] Perhaps his view was similar to that held by Menno Simons, especially in his earlier years.[89] At any rate Butzer wrote

79. V 81
80. V 104
81. V 157
82. V 170
83. V 470 f.
84. T B 196, 252, 257 f.
85. T B 224
86. T B 248
87. V 92
88. V 94
89. Lic. theol. Emil Händiges: *Die Lehre der Mennoniten in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* 1921, pp. 69 ff.

to Margaret Blaurer on October 23, 1531, stating: "Pilgram will not desist from baptizing and persuading people that swearing and defense by force are not right."[90] On the latter point Marpeck wrote repeatedly. We have already noted one of his references to the Peasants' Revolt, to Zwingli and to Münster.[91]

It is of course known to all careful students of Anabaptism that the Anabaptists[92] recognized human government as a divine institution and lived in strict obedience to it. Marpeck also expressed this viewpoint, and said further that he prayed for the government, yea, thanked God for it.[93] And a worldly government does and must employ force and the sword.[94] But he did not find in the gospel that true Christians shall employ force in the kingdom of this world.[95] To borrow a twentieth century figure, Marpeck and the Brethren believed that *Christ their divine Redeemer has totalitarian claims upon His people.* Marpeck's attitude is illustrated by an event which took place in Strasburg in 1531. A group of Anabaptists were in prison, among them Pilgram and his wife Anna. The government demanded an oath of allegiance from them. When the opportunity came, Pilgram and Anna Marpeck, also the latter's sister-in-law Barbara, were among those who were willing to signify their faithfulness, but only by a simple affirmation.[96]

Here are several quotations from the *Testament Explanation* on nonresistance: "To say that those of the Old Covenant were Christians . . . , since the earthly, Mosaic sword was used among them, is equivalent to saying that such use of the worldly sword is permitted in the church of Christ today. Through which the true spiritual order, the sword, discipline, ban, power and government of the Holy Spirit, of the true Church of Christ and the spiritual priests, would be broken up and annulled. And through such confusion (*vermischung*) of the two priesthoods and other things of the Old and New Testaments nothing follows but the introduction of a

90. Joh. Wilhelm Baum (1809-78): *Thesaurus epistolicus Reformatorem Alsaticorum,* quoted by Gerbert; *op. cit.,* p. 100.
91. T B 217 f. Cf. V 303 ff., 324, 393; T E 204 A.
92. Excluding the radicals such as the Münster group of 1534-5. Note John Horsch's splendid article, "Menno Simons' attitude toward the Anabaptists of Münster," *loc. cit.,* X, 1, pp. 55-72. Such people were for Pilgram "false (not genuine) Anabaptists." Q & F 183.
93. V 304
94. V 303
95. V 304
96. Röhrich: *loc. cit.,* p. 101 "Urpheden der Wiedertäufer zu Strassburg. 1530 und folgende Jahre."

desolation and wasting of the holy city. Dan. 9, Matt. 24, etc."[97] "Today [there is] another King, another Kingdom, another priesthood, another law, which is not a carnal law of ruling, or worldly, earthly judicial procedures as that of yesterday, but a spiritual, and a law or commandment of the Spirit,—love and patience, which God 'yesterday' promised and 'today' for the first time wrote in the hearts, and the Man Christ commanded his priests who were appointed today [in the New Covenant]. Also that they should love all people, not merely their friends or dear ones, but also their enemies, and not to resist evil, as is clearly shown in Matt. 5, Luke 6 and Rom. 12. Also that one should not use carnal weapons against another; nor they against their enemies. Isa. 2, Micah 4, Matt. 5. All bodily, worldly, carnal earthly fighting, conflicts and wars are annulled and abolished among them through such law. Psalms 4, 5, Hos. 2: Which law of love, Christ . . . then, as the present High Priest, Himself observed and thereby gave His followers a pattern to follow after."[98] In contrast, the "worldly government is not one which shows mercy, but is a revenger (Rom. 13), as the one breaking the law of Moses died without mercy (Heb. 10). And this law today outside of Christ stands unannulled by Christ for vengeance and discipline over the wicked."[99] This position is also in part due to the view of the church held by the Brethren.

6. *Ecclesiology*

The Brethren were determined to establish a church patterned after that of the New Testament. It goes without saying today that the New Testament church was a free church. It was composed of believers in Christ who had voluntarily accepted baptism and were walking in newness of life. This was the model after which the Brethren patterned. They were not anarchists in any sense of the word but they did insist that the state should attend to its own proper business and allow the church to do the same. This view of the separation of church and state, together with their insistence on believers' baptism, led to a great number of local mandates as well as imperial edicts against them. They were not only called upon to die as martyrs for the faith but they had to bear ridicule and epi-

97. T E 261 A, B
98. T E 313 A
99. T E 333 A

thets from those regarded as the greatest Reformers of the time.[1] Incidentally the word "Anabaptist" (*Wiedertäufer*), itself, was one of these terms of reproach. They repudiated this name, of course,[2] as well as that of *Taufbrüder*.[3]

After giving their interpretation of baptism as signifying willingness to die to sin and to lead a new life the Brethren added: Those who are thus minded and will so confess, shall receive baptism.[4] They forced and compelled no one, but those who gladly accepted the teaching of Christ allowed themselves to be baptized.[5] The church, they held, must consist of believers in Jesus Christ. "Its members are the chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy people of His possession. . . ."[6] The Church of Christ, inwardly as spiritual, and externally as a body before the Lord, consists of men born of God. They bear in their purified flesh and blood the sonship of God in the unity of the Holy Spirit, with cleansed minds and dispositions, just as each individual for himself before God in the Holy Ghost, has been cleansed in Christ Jesus.[7] The church as the body of Christ is the true mother which nourishes and preserves the newly-born of God unto a full age in Christ.[7] The church is the present house of God, the temple, the heavenly Jerusalem, the City of the Lord, the holy Zion of Israel.[8]

We are already acquainted with Marpeck's general position on the relation of the Covenants. Here we need only point out that it is the distinction between them which does away with a national church. Under the Old Covenant, he says, all Israel according to the flesh, without distinction, was called God's people.[9] Today however the real church of Christ "is called the people of God, not as they should be . . . but as they are; namely, all one believing people in one faith and spirit, one body, one soul, one heart, one faith, one baptism, through which they are all baptized into one body. . . . They are therefore called God's people, because of the unity of their

---

1. See John Horsch's article: "An Inquiry into the Truth of Accusations of Fanaticism and Crime against the Early Swiss Brethren," *loc. cit.*, VIII, 1, 2.
2. V 576
3. V 173
4. T B 209
5. V 71
6. V 435. Christians are a true people and priesthood of God. V 136
7. V 294
8. T E 191 A, 182 B
9. T E 209 A, 194 A, B

faith and wills, and not because of certain believing ones who are supposed to be among them."[10] "Today [in the New Testament age] for the first time is there a real spiritual church."[11]

Christ has but one church. The Brethren wrote: "Therefore we know only one church and not many, in which the Christians and God's children may be revealed and known, namely, those who are gathered together according to the command of Christ and are united in one Holy Spirit and love of God. We do not exclude by any means however (since the number of the elect is not yet completed) people on the earth of all sects and parts (but hidden to us) who shall be taken up and revealed with God's people."[12] "As it was in the time of the apostles when the children of God were located here and there in the cities and countries far from each other, yet assembled in spirit and faith as spiritual children in one apostolic church and body of Christ, so also shall the Lord gather together His elect, not from one place or country but from the four winds, yea from the one end of the heaven or the earth to the other."[13]

The Brethren knew only one church: an obedient church of regenerated people. Did they then consign all those not in their own group to perdition? The above passages hardly breathe that tone. Further, Marpeck explicitly wrote: "And Schwenckfeld accuses us without warrant that we condemn everyone who was not baptized in this way by us, but he cannot do so honestly. We commend them to the good judgment of God (since they did not submit themselves to us in faith to the obedience of Jesus Christ); He will judge those who are without" (I Cor. 5:12).[14]

The door, Marpeck once remarked, was too narrow for the rich young ruler. It also follows from Acts 14 that we must through much tribulation enter into the Kingdom of God.[15] For Marpeck the church was the present manifestation of the Kingdom,[16] and as we noted earlier, he regarded it as the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies of a kingdom of peace. The church of Christ, he says, has here in time a corporeal, visible, physical body, which also

10. T E 210 A
11. T E 260 B, 261 A
12. V 82; Cf. V 168
13. V 391
14. V 71. This Schwenckfeldian charge is also emphatically repudiated on p. 170.
15. V 129
16. T E 210 A, B: Therefore the church is also called the kingdom today because of the believers. Matt. 13. Cf. V 390, T B 211 etc.

belongs in the Kingdom of Christ and is here on earth in physical places and localities.[17]

The church is also built on Christ, and in the following sense, this being of course but a figure: "Indeed we know very well that the church is built by, and upon the one rock, Christ, upon the foundation which the apostles laid. But what is this foundation other than the teaching, preaching, confession and word which Christ spoke through the apostles and which the apostles called God's Word, which then is Jesus Christ; which the apostles all confessed and learned to confess that Jesus Christ is God's Son. . . ."[18] "Behold, in all such passages the confession of Jesus Christ (that He is God's Son) was preached and taught as a foundation . . . , the foundation and rock on which the Lord built and placed His church, and which is both firm and true."[19] "For Christ built His church on the confession of Peter and all believers who confess that He is the Lord and the Son of the living God. And he who confesses Him with Peter, from his own confession, is worthy of baptism."[20] The Christian Church began with Pentecost. "On this rock will I build my church," quotes Pilgram. He also points out that Christ did not say: "Have I built," but "will I build." It was now for the first time accomplished.[21] "Here it is clear how and when the Lord built His church . . . , namely, first after He was risen and with His resurrected body was sat down at the right hand of the Father."[21a] The church will never be crushed. Christ testifies through this word of Paul (I Cor. 11, 14) that His church will remain undisturbed until the day of His return.[22]

Since the *Vindication* is a polemic, written in reply to Schwenckfeld's *Criticism* of the *Treatise* of 1542, one of the main emphases of the book is the absolute necessity of setting up a church organization and administering baptism and communion, all of which Schwenckfeld failed to do in his Reformation of "the middle way." The *Vindication* contains a score of references and allusions to Schwenckfeld's policy of *Stillstand,* usually in a rather sharp tone.[23] The Brethren needed no new revelation for authority to set up a

17. V 477
18. V 306; Cf. 305
19. V 309
20. T B 228
21. T E 202 A
21a. T B 232
22. V 433; repeated, V 438
23. Cf. V 62, 68, 73, 78, 82, 105, 109, 132, 149, 157 ff., 433 ff., 571, 574.

church organization.[24] They had the Scriptures; that was sufficient authority. The Lord has so commanded; to fail to obey is unthinkable. Marpeck asserted that the present believers in Christ, as in the time of the apostles, always have the right to gather together in one body of Christ through the Holy Spirit.[25] All believers have the right to teach and exhort, indeed are obligated to do so[25]. Who can check the living fountain which springs from the heart? "Does not faith impel? Does not the Holy Ghost move? Does not love constrain? Does not Christ command? Who then will hinder or forbid? *Christians are all priests* and therefore all proclaim the virtues of Christ (I Pet. 2), each one according to the measure of his faith. The church still stands on the first foundation and therefore [has] the first authority or commission which was confirmed by the miracles of Christ and the apostles and was testified to in their and our blood. True believers in Christ know no other authority, command or commission, neither now nor until the end of the world."[25] The list of activities which Christ gave to His church included "baptism, communion, the laying-on of hands [ordination], foot-washing, teaching, exhorting, discipline, the ban" and everything which serves to build up His body the church.[26]

The Brethren insisted that they could truly regard their church as like the apostolic church, and this in spite of the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ or His Holy Spirit no longer confers the power of working miracles upon the present ministers and teachers of the church.[27] Those miracles in the apostolic church were performed to attest that Jesus was the Messiah. This is no longer necessary because we have the Scriptural account of this confirmation. Further, almost everyone today, even if the great majority of people do not possess the Holy Spirit, believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that the apostolic teaching recorded in the Scriptures is the truth. The Brethren held their leaders (fürsteer) to be comparable (in the sense of being true servants of Christ) with Paul, Peter, Timothy and Titus.[27] They were not interested in trying to prove apostolic succession, although they held that Christ's com-

24. Cf. John Horsch: "The Doctrine of the Church" (as held by the Swiss Brethren). *loc. cit.*, V, 4, pp. 245-256.
25. V 104 f.
26. V 105
27. V 405. It is interesting to note that Marpeck recognized that New Testament prophetism is no longer found in the Christian Church; at least he implies this when he mentions the New Testament apostles and prophets and then explains: "the prophets who were in the Church of Christ in the time of the apostles." T E 196 B

mands were truly observed in the church for over a millennium after His passion, resurrection and ascension. They were content in that they had an apostolic church, that is, a church apostolic in character.[28]

Marpeck insisted that the church must observe strictly the commands of the New Testament. His usual expression is a list of observances, such as "baptism, communion, the laying-on of hands, foot-washing, brotherly love, discipline, the ban, and the like."[29] He was strictly Biblical in knowing no "seven," or any other number of, ordinances. The various ordinances, commands and admonitions can obviously not be placed on one level; the Brethren did not try to do so. Their major emphasis fell on baptism, communion and the preaching of the Word. Conrad Grebel assuredly meant the former two when he spoke of the two ceremonies which Christ left us.[30]

It was of course because of their position on baptism that the Brethren were called *Täufer, Taufbrüder, Wiedertäufer, Anabaptisten, Taufgesinnten, Catabaptisten,* etc., all of which implied that their views on baptism were peculiar or overemphasized or distinctive. The Brethren felt that they were but teaching and practicing the baptism of the New Testament church. Baptism was for Marpeck a door or entrance into the holy church[31] and the church was the communion of believers on Christ, who live in the fruit of the Spirit, or "in the fruit of God," as he put it.[32] It signified the laying off of the old life of sin and the adoption of a new life.[33] One is baptized to the washing away and the forgiveness of sins through the shed blood of Jesus Christ.[34] Baptism has an inner and an outer aspect, yet the two aspects constitute but one baptism and testimony of the truth.[35] The Brethren thought of themselves as Christians, as people of the New Covenant.[36] Water baptism was

28. V 565
29. V 124
30. In his Protest to the Zurich Council. Published in the critical edition of Zwingli's Works, Bd. III, pp. 368-372. Reprinted in the *Gedenkschrift,* pp. 128-133. The above reference is found on p. 129.
31. T B 210, 220
32. T B 210
33. T B 211, 201
34. V 482
35. V 567. Mere water was not baptism, yet belongs to it. V 139.
36. Cf. T B 188 f. If one were seeking to formulate the theology of the Brethren from one central principle it would probably be: God, the Maker of the Covenants. Their theology would then work out about as follows: The contrast of the Covenants; the Maker of the Covenants; Christ, the Mediator of the Covenants; Man, Fallen and Redeemed; Christ's Work of Redemption; Christ's Covenant People; The Coming Glory.

the sign or seal of this Covenant.[37] Baptism is the putting on of Jesus Christ,[38] a marriage with Him,[39] a cleansing of the filthiness of the flesh, and the covenant of a good conscience with God.[40] Under this view, infant baptism is of course excluded. The Brethren also found their viewpoint confirmed in the New Testament; one finds no trace of infant baptism there. Christ said, Let the little children come to me. This was not for the purpose of baptism, however, but that He might bless them. Parents today must do the same, pray earnestly to Christ for their children.[41] The baptism of whole households[42] in the apostolic church meant for Marpeck of course, the baptism of proper candidates for baptism. The nature of baptism excluded infants. Marpeck also found the practise of having god-parents a grievous matter. No one can answer before God for another, much less for an infant. Everyone has enough with his own burden.[43] He was much opposed to monasticism, where one becomes a slave to human rules, and in place of believers' baptism adopts monastic garb.[44]

In his *Treatise on Baptism and the Lord's Supper* Marpeck examined several common arguments for infant baptism: 1. That it takes the place of circumcision.[45] Marpeck found circumcision a type only of the new birth, by which one enters the fold of the covenant people today. 2. Because of Christ's command to bring the children to Him.[46] This Marpeck demonstrated to be irrelevant. 3. Because of original sin, the Catholic view.[47] Marpeck considered this an unbiblical view of original sin, and found Luther in agreement. 4. Luther's argument that infants have "hidden" faith.[48] Marpeck agreed with Zwingli that this was not the case. He ridiculed Luther at this point, suggesting that one could just as well say that infants have "hidden" love. And further, since those not eating of Christ's "flesh" have no life, why not give infants communion? 5. The historical argument for infant baptism.[49] In common with

37. T B 237, 201
38. T B 201
39. T B 202
40. T B 203
41. T B 239
42. T B 248
43. T B 223
44. T B 222
45. T B 225 ff.
46. T B 238 ff.
47. T B 241 f.
48. T B 242. Also Calvin's future-faith concept.
49. T B 247

the Swiss Brethren Marpeck held that infant baptism was for the first time confirmed by Pope Eugene III, (1145-53). At this point he quoted Beatus Rhenanus, the Asatian humanist and Lutheran disciple, stating that believers' baptism was generally observed until the time of Charlemagne (768-814). He also quoted from Tertullian (ca. 155-220).[50] Marpeck placed no great weight on his historical argument, however, calling attention to the early corruption of the church. Even in the apostolic age there were baptisms for the dead.[51]

Marpeck seems indifferent to the mode of baptism. It is to be remembered that although the first baptisms in Zurich were by affusion, yet the question of mode never played a great role in early Anabaptist history. Indeed it is claimed that Conrad Grebel immersed a candidate who so desired in the Rhine near Schaffhausen, Switzerland.[52] Marpeck's books contain a score of references to the mode of baptism and he often says, "immersion or pouring."[53] Yet when Schwenckfeld criticized the *Treatise* and mentioned their "immersion in water,"[54] the Brethren replied, using the word ***begiessen,*** which refers to the application of water to the candidate, i. e. pouring.[55] And thereafter the Brethren usually referred to their baptism as by affusion.[56] Marpeck at least would certainly have opposed a radical emphasis on immersion. With him it was faith in Christ which was all-important.[57]

The Lord's supper was for Pilgram first of all a common eating and drinking of the bread and wine in memory of Christ's suffering and death for us.[58] In this respect he was Zwinglian.[59] The Lord's supper was also given for the refreshing, strengthening and comforting of the soul.[60] As he partakes of the emblems he must bear in mind two things. First, the fundamental facts of the gospel, that the Son of God became man; that He was conceived of the

50. T B 247
51. T B 248 [I Cor. 15:29]
52. *Menn. Lexicon,* Bd. I, 1913-24, p. 120.
53. See, e. g., T B 102, 196, 201, 206 etc. V 75.
54. V 111
55. V 113. Yet the dispute here had no particular reference to the mode of baptism.
56. V 138 (3x), 169, 456, 564, 570.
57. V 113, 139; T B 205 f.
58. T B 254, 261
59. Dr. Chr. Neff also called attention to the position of Marpeck regarding the Lord's supper. But he did not establish the point that Marpeck went beyond Zwingli, who regarded the meal as a memorial. *Menn. Lex.* I, 8b, 9a.
60. T B 261

Holy Ghost and the seed of woman in Mary; that He was born a true, natural, earthly man of the tribe and seed of David; that He gave His earthly, natural life and body in death and shed His blood for the forgiveness of human sins. Secondly, one must be grateful and consider his indebtedness to Christ. Christians must humble themselves, and forsake their own lives out of genuine love for His name's sake, and love one another as Christ loved them.[61] It goes without saying that Marpeck opposed transubstantiation,[62] considering it a superstitious error of the first rank. Of course, he discussed the current theological disagreements on the meaning of the phrases, "This is my body," "This is my blood." Before doing so, however, he expressed his view by quoting the words, "Let a man examine himself." Paul does not say, Marpeck reminds us, that we should examine the bread and wine, what they are. But man must examine himself. "Are you filled in the whole heart with the love of Christ and for your neighbor? Are you inclined to exemplify Christ to your brethren, also to your enemies, according to the words of Jesus?"[63]

Finally Marpeck came to his survey of the various views of the communion. Here he relied somewhat on the writings of Sebastian Franck (1499-ca. 1542) and Heinrich Bullinger (1504-75), Zwingli's successor in Zurich, being careful, however, to state his belief that these writers were in error on many theological questions.[64] After a rapid survey of some of the early Church Fathers he divided the current theological opinions into three groups, and concluded with his own. The first was the Catholic view of transubstantiation.[65] With this view Marpeck had no sympathy. Then Luther's view that Christ's body and blood were somehow present in the emblems, the emblems being called His body and blood by synecdoche.[66] This view also was unsatisfactory to Pilgram. The third view was that advanced by Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) of Zurich and by Johannes Oecolampad (1482-1531), the Basel Reformer, and held by many scholars in Germany and in Friesland, the Netherlands, namely that the words of Jesus are to be understood figura-

61. T B 262
62. T B 254
63. T B 259
64. T B 264
65. T B 270
66. T B 271

tively, as if Jesus had said, This *signifies* my body.[67] With these theologians Marpeck agreed, being careful to state, of course, that his agreement was not a general endorsement of their theology. In giving his own view[68] Marpeck first calls attention to the fact that the expressions of Jesus, "which is given for you," and, "shed for you," referred necessarily to Christ's own physical body which was slain and offered on the cross. No transubstantiation takes place. In a discussion of baptism and communion on another occasion, Marpeck remarked that the bread, wine and water remain such.[69] He therefore concluded that Christ spoke figuratively of the bread and wine.[70]

Further, baptism and communion are in a sense a proclamation of the Gospel. Besides the external preaching of the Gospel, Christ also established and commanded the outward baptism and communion.[71] And just as baptism has both an inner aspect, the cleansing by the Holy Ghost, and an outer aspect, the use of water, so the Lord's supper has an inner and an outer aspect, yet there is but one Lord's supper,[72] even as there is only one baptism. To turn to the *Testament Explanation* again: "The Man Jesus Christ is the present heavenly bread, and the bread which He has given is His body and flesh . . . which He has 'today' given for the life of the world . . . and which He offered to His own to eat in the communion in the figure of material bread. Through which present eating, participating in the body or flesh of Christ through His death, one first becomes one bread and one body. I Cor. 10 [v. 17]. Which body is the church of Christ."[73]

In conformity with his Biblical faith, Marpeck often mentions the observance of foot-washing.[74] Incidentally, there seems to be no exegetical consideration against its literal observance which would not at the same time bear against the observance of the Lord's supper.[74a] Marpeck usually mentions foot-washing in connection with lists of Christian practices: baptism, communion, foot-washing,

67. T B 271 f.
68. T B 273 f.
69. V 454
70. T B 273 f.
71. T B 274
72. V 454
73. T E 273 B
74. V 71, 80, 90, 105, 113, 119, 124, 141, 144, 149, 154, 314; T B 255.
74a. (My own observation.)

laying-on of hands, teaching, discipline, prayer, giving of alms, manifesting love to one's neighbor, etc.[75] It is one of the things which Christ commanded us to observe.[76] The Brethren observed it because Christ commanded it, although in their minds its reason was not evident and they were regarded as fools for observing it.[77] They suggested to their "dear friend" Schwenckfeld that he ought to stoop to the practise.[78]

As we have noted, Marpeck's lists of Christian duties and practices included discipline. This was a faithful adherence to the teachings of the New Testament, a Biblical means of keeping the church what the Lord intended it to be. In brief it varied in degree from a personal rebuke to exclusion from the Lord's supper and the fellowship of the church. Marpeck does not deal with it in detail; he merely mentions it in connection with the Lord's supper and the maintenance of the purity of the church.[79] The leading Reformers of course were unable to make discipline a permanent practice in their state churches. It is passing strange to the present writer, however, that anyone should seek to justify a lack of discipline by an appeal to the parable of Jesus of the wheat and tares (Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43).[80] The very least anyone could possibly learn from the parable of Jesus would be toleration for religious dissenters. Yet the Reformers failed to see even this. Marpeck wrote: "Christ said, The field is the world, and only the good seed is called the children of the Kingdom, that is God's people. Otherwise if one should understand the field (that is, the world) for the Kingdom of God it would follow that one would have to reckon the [Mohammedan] Turks and [unbelieving] Jews in God's Kingdom since they are also in this field of the world. It would also follow that the ban of Christ, to excommunicate the evil [doer] (I Cor. 5) would be annulled. What sort of a pure, unspotted . . . church and adorned bride would thereby be brought to Christ? Therefore one must understand the passage Matt. 13 otherwise, and the Kingdom of God for what . . . it is."[81]

Marpeck's "ban" was "brotherly discipline."[82] It was not capital

75. V 113
76. V 144, 154
77. V 119
78. V 90
79. T B 277, 280
80. Cf. Schrenk: *op. cit.*, p. 43 (This reference is to Bullinger).
81. T E 210 B
82. T B 263

punishment, or even persecution such as exile from a city or country. That does not belong to the Christian church, he says, and it can never find a place in the Kingdom of Christ.[83] Neither did Marpeck have any place for the rigid "avoidance"[84] practiced by some of the North German and Dutch Mennonites. Marpeck wrote: "Christ said, One shall regard him as a heathen; Paul [said] not as an enemy but as a friend."[85] The ban shall be conducive to betterment and repentance. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy but to save all men.[86]

We have already noted the prominent place which the Brethren gave to preaching, to the proclamation of the Word, to teaching. Incidentally the Anabaptists were strongly evangelistic. *God's will must be carried out;* the Word must be proclaimed. The remarkable spread of Anabaptism in spite of the most bitter persecution is a testimony to the early missionary activities of the Brethren. Foreign missions were of course out of the question in those bloody times; they first began with colonial enterprise. Only after decades of bitter suppression and the slaughter of almost all the gifted leaders of the Anabaptists, did the group settle down to a "hold your own" basis. Evangelism meant for the Brethren the teaching of the Bible. They frankly admitted that they had neither a catechism nor catechumens.[87] Christ's command to baptize (Matt. 28:19, 20) was not limited to His contemporary disciples, for He included all future disciples—that is, believers—who would believe in Him through all time to the end of the world. To that He testified, when after giving this command He immediately added: I am with you every day until the end of the world.[88]

Unfortunately Marpeck had no occasion to discuss the organization of the individual congregations of the Brethren. In his extant works he does not discuss the various offices in the church. He speaks of the one who preaches the Word as the "diener des worts."[89] Again the one baptizing a convert he also calls a "die-

83. T B 263

84. Denial of ordinary social intercourse to one who has been excommunicated. It was in some cases applied even to marital relations. It usually referred to eating together, etc.

85. T B 263

86. T B 263

87. V 74

88. V 433

89. V 74

ner."[90] He also refers to the bishops ("fürsteer") of his group,[91] but without identifying them with, or distinguishing them from, the ministers or preachers. Finally, he mentions "prophets, bishops (Bischoff), helpers, rulers, teachers and the like"—obviously in general terms.[92] His most significant expression is the use of the ordinary word for minister ("diener") for the one who baptized converts.[93]

Marpeck's conception of the church then was of a group of sincere Christians, baptized on confession of faith, kept pure by discipline, observing all the commands of the New Testament and composed of those who are filled with love.[94]

7. *Eschatology*

Most of the time it was a rather cold world for the Brethren. The Christian life was for them essentially a bearing of the cross. As they looked upon the world they saw intense suffering. The scourge of syphilis had just been introduced to Europe; it is difficult to imagine the havoc it wrought. The poverty of the time was appalling. The Mohammedan Turks and the Jews were the standing examples of current unbelief. Catholicism was politically active and morally corrupt. Protestantism had broken into numerous parties, mutually antagonistic. Little wonder that many good Christians felt that the end of the world was imminent. The Swabian Reformer, Ambrosius Blaurer wrote to his friend Butzer in Strasburg on December 23, 1533, reporting among other things: "Daily we hear of signs in the heavens, falling stars, armed horsemen in the clouds, flying dragons and serpents, pestilence, famine . . . , all of which announces the end of the world and [the fact that] the Judge is at the door."[1] Since Marpeck was living in such a period and in such an atmosphere it would be only natural if we should find him also possessed with such strong eschatological expectations. As a matter of fact, however, he was singularly free of them. This must be attributed to his faithful and sober loyalty to the Scriptures

90. V 138
91. V 405
92. T E 78 A. See also V 101, 298
93. V 138
94. V 438, 442 etc. The Brethren knew a "communism" only in the sense of helping one another when in need. They did not favor a required-communism such as the Hutterites practiced. Cf. T B 265

1. Schiess: *Briefwechsel,* p. 453.

—refusing to set himself up as a prophet—and perhaps to a liberal share of good sense. Apart from a few references to Biblical phrases such as, "last and perilous times,"[2] one may say that Marpeck gives no evidence of having prophesied or expected the end of the world in his day.

Yet one cannot conclude that he did not believe in the second coming of Christ. The *Vindication* alone contains fifty references to the Lord's return and events associated with it. Often he speaks in Biblical language: The Lord's supper shall be observed (show forth His death) "until he come."[3] He told His disciples to "watch" until His return.[4] I am with you every day until the end of the world.[4] We must see many things through a glass darkly until the second coming of Christ from heaven.[5] Believers, or the good seed, or the Church of Christ, will remain on earth, "growing beside the bad," until the harvest, which is the end of the world."[6] The "second coming of Christ" was for Marpeck synonymous with "the end of the world."[7] The end of the world is *das Ziel,*[8] that is, the goal. Christ's second coming will be bodily, seen of all men.[9] It will bring to us eternal salvation and joy;[10] for it we wait with sighs.[11] Many are Marpeck's references to the Day of Judgment,[12] to the just judgment of God,[13] to the fact that Christ has been given authority to hold the judgment.[14] "Present" faith, that is, the New Covenant in Jesus Christ, is the faith which will stand the test on the Judgment Day.[15] The world will stand until the Judgment Day.[16] Christ will return in His glorified body on the Day of Judgment.[17] He will come down from heaven with His lustrous, glorified, spiritual body, to hold the Judgment.[18] He will find little faith on the earth at His return.[19]

---

2. V 84, 148; T B 187
3. V 105
4. V 106
5. V 357
6. V 438
7. V 106, 158, 179 etc.
8. T E 187 B
9. V 504
10. V 393
11. V 343
12. V 223, 233, 503
13. V 242
14. V 299
15. V 369
16. V 437
17. V 485, 503 f.
18. V 509
19. T B 278

His return will not only be for judgment but it will mark the completion of our redemption. Present believers believe in and wait for the redemption which shall come at the return of Christ.[20] His coming will signify their glorification. Christ's body, the Church, will be glorified at His coming.[21] Marpeck speaks of future redemption, of the bodily resurrection of the flesh, of the glorification of our bodies, etc.[22] The resurrection will be a resurrection of these present bodies. The righteous will be like the angels in the resurrection. That does not mean like the angels in the sense of being without flesh.[23] It will be a bodily resurrection.[24] Paul's statement, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body," is not to be so understood as though the corporeity, humanity, flesh and blood and human nature of men, that which physically dies, will be laid aside. Otherwise Paul's use of the word body is meaningless. This is the meaning: The natural body of the believer, even this one which is "sown" or physically dies, will be translated or changed through the bodily resurrection into a spiritual body, from which all earthly situations or things will be laid aside, together with all blameworthiness and every evil, dishonorable inclination. It will no longer be possible to fall, to covet, to hate, to envy, to be angry, etc., after the manner of the mortal body in which it is "sown."[25] We shall still be creatures after the resurrection and will retain our corporeity.[26] This resurrection life is "the coming glory."[27] Christ attested the bodily resurrection of the dead on the Last Day.[28] Christ will come on the Judgment, or the Last Day.[29] Marpeck seems to thrill with joy as he frequently refers to resurrection glory.

Concerning the wicked, Marpeck has little to say. He remarks, however, that punishment under the Old Covenant is but a figure of eternal punishment.[30]

Marpeck rather expected a national conversion of the Jews be-

20. T E 5 B
21. V 154; cf. 287
22. V 331
23. V 194
24. V 238, 403 f.
25. V 510 (condensed)
26. V 566
27. T E 181 B
28. T E 122 A; Cf. V 467
29. V 501
30. V 376

fore the end of the world,[31] yet assuredly only in the sense of being gathered into Christ's church. They will enter the Kingdom of Christ.[31] Of the belief that Christ shall one day reign as an earthly monarch in Jerusalem Marpeck knows nothing, except that he observed[32] that such a belief was entertained by Christ's disciples prior to His death and the sending of the Holy Spirit. When Christ died on the cross, these nationalistic hopes in the hearts of the apostles also died, as Christ also testified against the apostles after His resurrection and rebuked them for their unbelief. For before Christ's resurrection they knew Him only according to the flesh. They knew nothing of the working and power of the Holy Spirit.[32] Any such view of an earthly kingdom of Christ would have been considered by Marpeck a *vermischung Alts und News Testaments.*

31. V 63
32. V 302

ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1937–1938

SILAS HERTZLER

The attendance statistics herewith presented represent the tenth annual compilation for the Mennonite schools and colleges of the United States and Canada. These data cover the attendance for the school year 1937-38, and for the summer of 1937. Because of the difficulty in getting the necessary information, several of the smaller and less well established schools which appeared in some of the previous reports are not included this year. However, an attempt was made to secure the data from all schools which had previously co-operated.

Two sources of information were used. A questionnaire was sent to the registrar, or in some cases to the principal, of each of the co-operating schools. The information given was summarized in the thirteen tables which follow. In a few cases additional data were secured from the annual catalogs of the institutions concerned. Appropriate footnotes indicate such cases where information supplementing the questionnaires was found.

Twenty schools returned the questionnaires sent to them. Thirteen of the schools included last year sent no replies, hence no statistics could be included. The Reedley Bible School of Reedley, California was moved to Dinuba, California, and is now known as the Dinuba Bible School. The institutions included at this time are:

Bethel College, Bethel College, Kansas
Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana
Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio
Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas
Freeman Junior College, Freeman, South Dakota
Eastern Mennonite School, Harrisonburg, Virginia
Hesston College and Bible School, Hesston, Kansas
Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Gretna, Manitoba
German-English Academy, Rosthern, Saskatchewan
Ontario Mennonite Bible School, Kitchener, Ontario
Corn Bible School and Academy, Corn, Oklahoma
Oklahoma Bible Academy, Meno, Oklahoma
Morgenstern Bible School, Coaldale, Alberta
Tabor Bible School, Dalmeny, Saskatchewan
Herbert Bible School, Herbert, Saskatchewan

Mountain Lake Bible School, Mountain Lake, Minnesota
Dinuba Bible School, Dinuba, California
Zoar Academy and Bible School, Inman, Kansas
Bethesda Bible School, Henderson, Nebraska
Mennonite Bible Academy, Beatrice, Nebraska

Table I lists the twenty co-operating schools in the order of attendance in all departments, the school with the largest gross attendance being named first. The schools are rearranged in each of the following tables under the same plan. Hence Table II names the schools in the order of numbers in the college department. Table III uses the same method in grouping the schools with academy, high school, or other non-college students.

An interesting observation is the fact that even though there are thirteen less schools included in the list for 1937-38, than for 1936-37, the total attendance is only 198 less. Also that the attendance in the twenty institutions reporting for the present school year is 90 larger than for the twenty-four schools reporting in 1935-36, which had been the largest attendance reported up to that date. College students are reported in nine institutions in Kansas, Indiana, Ohio, South Dakota, Virginia, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. The total of 1431 college students is 189 more than the number reported the previous year. The number of Mennonite students of college grade is 141 larger than for the year 1936-37. The institutions not reporting were mainly the smaller schools of academy grade, so there are 241 less Mennonite students of high school grade included in this year's report.

Eleven Mennonite groups are included in the list given in Table IV. However, by far the largest percentage of those students are members of the "Old" Mennonites, the General Conference and the Mennonite Brethren. Table V lists the non-Mennonite students by denominations. The largest bodies represented are the Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran and Evangelical churches. In all, twenty-four non-Mennonite religious groups are included.

Mennonite students in the schools represented come from twenty-eight states; from the District of Columbia; from four Canadian provinces; from China, India, and from the Argentine. Kansas, with three Mennonite Colleges, is the home of approximately one out of every five Mennonite students in the schools reporting. Pennsylvania, this year, ranks second. Non-Mennonite students live in twenty-one states and in four Canadian provinces. Men-

nonite students of college grade and of high school grade are reported in Tables VIII and IX. Eighty-two more college students are reported, due only in part to the fact that students of college grade were reported in two additional institutions. There was an increase of thirty-nine students in the seven schools that had previously sent in reports. The decrease in Table IX is due perhaps entirely to the failure to secure the necessary information from the schools previously included in the study.

The summer attendance, reported only in the three colleges granting degrees, is small as in the past. A slight increase, however, is reported in each of these institutions, as shown in Table X. Women students outnumber the men by one hundred and twelve. The proportion of men is somewhat larger than at some times in the past. Out of the eighteen schools giving the information on this point only five have more men students. Table XI summarizes these data.

Table XIII reports degrees and diplomas for the spring and summer of 1937. Fourteen more degrees were granted than in 1936. This increase was largely at Bethel College, with a slight increase at Goshen. The table as a whole shows a decrease in the total number of diplomas. This is in part due to a misinterpretation of the statistics in three institutions, as previously reported. A large increase—from sixty-seven to one hundred and thirty-nine diplomas —from the four-year academy or high-school course is the most noticeable change from previous reports. Table XII brings the summarized data for the last ten years down to date.

Table I

TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1937-38

Schools	College	Academy or High School	Bible	Other Depart-ments	Total Enrollment
Goshen College	409	...	88	...	497[1]
Bethel College	432	...	...	37[3]	469[2]
Eastern Mennonite School	50	122	143	39[4]	354
Hesston College	43	113	107[7]	27[6]	290
Bluffton College	246	...	...	40[5]	286
Tabor College	147	67	...	1[6]	215
Ontario Bible School	...	...	180[8]	...	180
Freeman Junior College	61	87	...	...	148
Mennonite Collegiate Institute	23	57	...	...	80
Corn Bible Academy	...	73	...	...	73
Oklahoma Bible Academy	...	60	12	...	72
German-Eng. Academy	20	28	12	...	60
Morgenstern Bible School	...	46	...	...	46
Tabor Bible School	...	38	...	...	38
Herbert Bible School	...	37	...	...	37
Mountain Lake Bible School	...	24	...	...	24
Dinuba Bible School[9]	...	23	...	...	23
Zoar Acad. and Bible School	...	23	...	...	23
Bethesda Bible School	...	12	...	...	12
The Mennonite Bible Acad.	...	11	...	...	11
Total	1431	821	542	144	2938

[1] Not including 26 Bible Correspondence students
[2] Bethel College Bulletin, April 27, 1938, p. 90
[3] Non-credit music students
[4] Bible correspondence students not of college grade
[5] Music and art students
[6] Correspondence and extension students not of college grade
[7] Includes 100 special six-weeks Bible term students
[8] School term of twelve weeks annually
[9] The Reedley Bible School has been transferred to Dinuba, California

Table II

Enrollment by Classes, College Students, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937-38

College	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Special	Summer	Other Depts.	Total
Bethel	43	60	90	154	11	74	...	432
Goshen	43	23	88	129	48	65	13[1]	409
Bluffton	33	39	51	67	16	40	...	246
Tabor	...	...	50	80	...	...	17[2]	147
Freeman	...	...	12	48	1	...	...	61
E. M. S.	1	1	18	30	...	...	...	50[3]
Hesston	...	...	10	29	4	...	...	43
M. C. I.	...	...	...	23	...	...	...	23
Ger.-Eng. Acad.	...	...	...	20	...	...	...	20
Total	120	123	319	580	80	179	30	1431

[1] Eleven Post graduate students, 2 correspondence students
[2] Unclassified college students
[3] Eighteen are registered in a Bible course of college grade

Table III

Enrollment by Classes, Students not of College Grade, 1937-38

School	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Unclassified	Bible	Other Depts.	Total
E. M. S.	48	53	20	21	2	121[3]	39[1]	304
Hesston	41	12	41	40	...	120[3]	13[1]	247[5]
Ontario	...	...	...	...	...	180	...	180
Goshen	...	...	...	...	...	88[3]	...	88
Freeman	23	32	18	14	...	...	...	87
Corn	11	24	18	20	...	...	...	73
Oklahoma	13	12	17	18	...	12	...	72
Tabor	18	20	16	13	...	...	1[1]	68
M. C. I.	...	20	24	13	...	...	...	57
Morgenstern	...	...	21	25	...	...	...	46
Bluffton	...	...	...	...	...	...	40[4]	40
Ger.-Eng. Acad.	...	16	15	9	...	...	...	40[6]
Dalmeny	...	3	7	28	...	...	...	38
Bethel	...	...	...	...	...	...	37[2]	37
Herbert	...	6	11	20	...	...	...	37
Mountain Lake	...	...	5	19	...	...	...	24
Dinuba Bible S.	...	...	7	16	...	...	...	23
Zoar	...	...	10	13	...	...	...	23
Henderson	...	...	4	8	...	...	...	12
Beatrice	...	...	7	4	...	...	...	11
Total	154	188	241	271	2	521	130	1507

[1] Correspondence students not of college grade
[2] Non-credit music students
[3] Bible students for six-weeks term
[4] Fine arts students not of college rank
[5] Includes 21 students in elementary Bible and in the Christian workers' course
[6] Includes 12 Bible students

Table IV

MENNONITE STUDENTS IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1937-38

Denomination	Goshen	E. M. S.	Hesston	Bethel	Ontario	Tabor	Freeman	Bluffton	M. C. I.	Oklahoma	Corn
"Old" Mennonites	346	342	216	1	163	..	..	1	..	..	..
General Conference	3	..	41	231	..	7	73	79	46	72	4
Mennonite Brethren	2	..	3	5	..	137	5	..	22	..	66
Krimmer Menn. Brethren	..	..	..	2	..	20	..	..	..	..	1
Mennonite Unclassified	..	..	..	..	1[1]	..	19	..	..	..	..
Evangelical Menn. Brethren	..	..	..	..	..	6	20	..	..	..	..
Central Conference	14	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	..	..	..
Amish Mennonites	..	7	..	..	13	..	..	..	..	..	..
Menn. Brethren in Christ	4	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..
Defenseless Mennonites	..	..	1	1	..	..	5	3	..	..	..
Sommerfelder	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	..	..
Kleinegemeinde	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..
Total	369	349	261	240	177	170	126	92	78	72	71

[1] Member of the Sterling Avenue Mennonite Church

Table IV—Continued

Denomination	Ger. Eng.	Morgenst'n	Dalmeny	Dinuba	Mt. Lake	Zoar	Herbert	Bethesda	Beatrice	Total
"Old" Mennonites	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1069
General Conference	51	1	4	..	3	1	3	12	..	631
Mennonite Brethren	5	44	22	17	15	..	16	..	..	359
Krimmer Menn. Brethren	..	..	..	5	..	22	..	..	..	50
Mennonite Unclassified	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	11	31
Evangelical Menn. Brethren	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	27
Central Conference	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	23
Amish Mennonites	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	20
Menn. Brethren in Christ	..	..	12	..	..	..	..	..	..	20
Defenseless Mennonites	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	15
Sommerfelder	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	12
Kleinegemeinde	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Total	57	45	38	23	23	23	21	12	11	2258

Table V

Non-Mennonite Students in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937-38

Denomination	Bethel	Bluffton	Goshen	Tabor	Hesston	Freeman	Herbert	E. M. S.	German English	Ontario	Corn	M. C. I.	Morgenstern	Mt. Lake	Total
Statistics not given	131	36	5		13										185
Methodist Episcopal	22	43	33	2	7			1							108
Non Church Members	5	13	10	27	1		15	2							73
Presbyterian	12	15	9	2								2			40
Lutheran	1	11	9		1	2			2						37
Evangelical	11	72	84	3	5	11		2		1					36
United Brethren	3	20	2			1				1					28
Reformed		19	5			3		2			1				27
Brethren	1		24										1		25
Baptist	6	3	3	7		1					1				22
Christian	7	3	7	1		1									19
Congregational	6	4	5												16
Methodist Protestant	14	7	3												14
Roman Catholic	2	1	3			1			1						12
Episcopalian	3	1	3												9
Church of Christ	2	5													7
Christian Miss. Alliance	1	3	11		1	15				16				1	5
Interdenominational		18													5
Friends	1	1	1			1									3
Church of God	1		1	1											2
Nazarene	1			1											2
Christian Science			1												1
Hebrew		1					1								1
Pentecostal															1
River Brethren					1										1
Unitarian		1													1
Total	229	194	128	45	29	22	16	5	3	3	2	2	1	1	680

[1] Member of the "Cicero Bible" church
[2] Two are members of the "Evangelical Reformed" church
[3] Member of the "Federated" church
[4] Members of the Swedish Evangelical Mission
[5] International Bible student
[6] The United Church of Canada

Table VI

States, Provinces, and Countries from which Mennonite Students Come, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937-38

States	Goshen	E. M. S.	Hesston	Bethel	Ontario	Tabor	Freeman	Bluffton	M. C. I.	Oklahoma	Coyn	German English	Morgenst'n	Dalmeny	Dinuba	Mt. Lake	Zoar	Herbert	Bethesda	Beatrice	Total
Kansas	9		142	190		82		17		3							23				449
Pennsylvania	33	182			1						71	571	2	38							233
Oklahoma	87	17	5	13		43		55		68						22					200
Ohio	3	3	1	1	15				3									2			176
Ontario	127	1	1	2	138			7							23			19			148
Indiana				6		1	125														138
South Dakota				3	3	1										1			12	11	132
Saskatchewan	1	92							75				2	38							123
Virginia						5		9													93
Manitoba	48	1	3																		82
Illinois			11	9		16		1								1					61
Nebraska	18	2	29																		60
Iowa					1	2		1					41					2			50
Alberta	8	13	2	2	16	1	1								23						46
Michigan	1	1		2		9															41
California	6	3	23	2																	36
Oregon			2	4		3										22					34
Minnesota	3	19																			31
Maryland	2		11	4																	22
Idaho	2		13																		17
Colorado	3		11		3																15
Missouri	2	5				2	1			1											14
New York	2		4			2															10
North Dakota	5		1			2		2													9
Texas	3																				9
No Statistics	3			1		2															5
India				1																	4
Montana	1	3																			4
Delaware		3																			3
West Virginia		2		1																	3
Dist. of Columbia																					2
Mississippi			1	1																	2
New Jersey	2																				2
Argentina	1					1															1
China		1																			1
Florida				1																	1
Washington																					1
Totals	369	349	261	240	177	170	126	92	78	72	71	57	45	38	23	23	23	21	12	11	2258

[1] Assumed that all students are from Saskatchewan

Table VII

STATES, PROVINCES, AND COUNTRIES FROM WHICH NON-MENNONITE STUDENTS COME, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1937-38

States	Bethel	Bluffton	Goshen	Tabor	Hesston	Freeman	Herbert	E. M. S.	German English	Ontario	Corn	M. C. I.	Morgenstern	Mt. Lake	Total
Ohio	..	175	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	176
No statistics	134	..	..	..	13	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	147
Kansas	90	..	..	25	13	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	128
Indiana	1	..	119	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	120
South Dakota	..	..	..	..	..	22	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	22
Saskatchewan	..	..	..	1	..	..	16	..	31	1	..	..	..	..	21
Oklahoma	2	..	..	8	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	13
Illinois	..	2	4	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
Kentucky	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7
Manitoba	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	7
Pennsylvania	..	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
California	1	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Virginia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
New York	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Colorado	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Ontario	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	2
Texas	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Alberta	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1
Arizona	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Louisiana	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Maryland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Michigan	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Minnesota	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1
Nebraska	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
New Jersey	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
North Dakota	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Totals	229	194	128	45	29	22	16	5	3	3	2	2	1	1	680

[1] Assumed that all students are from Saskatchewan

Table VIII

MENNONITE STUDENTS OF COLLEGE GRADE, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1937-38

School	Men	Women	Total
Goshen	139	142	281[3]
Bethel	128	112	240
Tabor	55	59	114
Bluffton	36	42	78[1]
Hesston	22	35	57
E. M. S.	25	24	49
Freeman	19	23	42
M. C. I.	18	5	23
Ger.-English	..	..	20[2]
Total	442	442	904

[1] Six Mennonite students for whom statistics were not given in exact detail
[2] Assumed that all college students were Mennonites
[3] Twenty-seven Mennonite students for whom the information was not given in detail

Table IX

Mennonite Students Not of College Grade, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937-38

School	Men	Women	Total
E. M. S.	124	176	300
Hesston	104	100	204
Ontario	87	90	177[2]
Goshen	43	45	88
Freeman	37	47	84
Oklahoma	34	38	72
Corn	29	42	71
Tabor	24	32	56
M. C. I.	41	14	55
Morgenstern	25	20	45
Dalmeny	14	24	38
Ger.-Eng. Academy	..	..	37[1]
Dinuba	7	16	23
Mt. Lake	9	14	23
Zoar	9	14	23
Herbert	6	15	21
Bluffton	..	..	14[1]
Bethesda	..	..	12[1]
Beatrice	8	3	11
Total	601	690	1354

[1] Detailed statistics not available
[2] Statistics uncertain for three students

Table X

Summer Session, 1937 Mennonite Schools and Colleges

School	Men	Women	Total
Goshen	42	56	98[2]
Bethel	33	61	94
Bluffton	22	54	76
Total	97	171	268[1]

[1] These totals include duplicates with the regular school year
[2] Two summer terms. This total does not include duplicates

Table XI

Total Attendance, Men and Women, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937-38

School	Men	Women	Total
Goshen	237	260	497
Bethel	238	231	469[1]
E. M. S.	153	201	354
Hesston	135	155	290
Bluffton	148	138	286[2]
Tabor	105	110	215
Ontario	88	92	180
Freeman	64	84	148
M. C. I.	60	20	80
Corn	30	43	73
Oklahoma	34	38	72
Ger.-Eng. Academy	..	..	60[3]
Morgenstern	26	20	46
Dalmeny	14	24	38
Herbert	12	25	37
Mt. Lake	9	15	24
Dinuba	7	16	23
Zoar	9	14	23
Bethesda	..	..	12[3]
Beatrice	8	3	11
Total	1377	1489	2938

[1] Bethel College Bulletin, April 27, 1938, page 90
[2] The Bluffton College Bulletin, April, 1938, page 71
[3] Detailed statistics not given

Table XII

Attendance, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1928-38

Year	Mennonite	Non-Mennonite	College	Academy	Bible	Other Depts.	Total
1928-29	1025	513	847	569	...	122	1538
1929-30	1259	708	1085	609	...	273	1967
1930-31	1515	665	1234	710	110	126	2180
1931-32	1337	591	944	522	259	203	1928
1932-33	1135	538	906	416	277	74	1673
1933-34	1259	476	921	348	402	64	1735
1934-35	1742	530	1025	550	502	195	2272
1935-36	2274	574	1151	1050	470	177	2848
1936-37	2640	496	1242	948	800	146	3136
1937-38	2258	680	1431	821	542	144	2938

Table XIII

Diplomas Given and Degrees Granted, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937

	Goshen	Bethel	Bluffton	Freeman	E. M. S.	Hesston	Tabor	Corn	M. C. I.	Ontario	Oklahoma	Zoar	Dinuba	Herbert	Dalmeny	Total
B. A.	27	40	24	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	91
B. S. in Education	17	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	17
B. of School Music	..	2	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
B. S. in Industrial Arts	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
B. S. in Home Ec.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Th. B.	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Junior College	..	..	..	4	6	6	15	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	31
Two Year Normal	37	..	..	2	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	42
One Year Normal	..	..	..	24	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	24
Adv. Bible (2 Yr. College)	1	..	..	..	4	3	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	10
Academy (4 years)	..	..	..	20	22	35	21	11	17[1]	..	13	..	..	..	..	139
Elem. Bible (3 years)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	..	..	..	..	..	6	3	25
Elem. Bible (2 years)	..	..	..	..	12	1	..	..	..	..	..	13	7	..	..	33
Elem. Bible (1 year)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14	..	..	..	..	..	14
Commercial Course	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Total	82	48	28	50	48	45	40	27	17	14	13	13	7	6	3	441

[1] The Canadian high school course may be completed in three years

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON THE LIFE AND WORK OF PILGRAM MARPECK

John C. Wenger

Christian Hege, of Frankfurt a. M., Germany, co-editor of the *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, kindly called my attention to an omission in the article on Pilgram Marpeck in the July number of The Mennonite Quarterly Review. In 1531 a booklet appeared which is believed to have been written by Marpeck. The title page was as follows:

> Ain klarer vast nutzlicher unterricht, wider ettliche trück red (?) schleichendt Geister so jetzt in verborgener weisz ausgeen dadurch viel frommer herzen verirrt und verführt werden, kürzlich, getrewer warnung weisz herfürgebracht 1. betreffend das Apostelampt 2. das bischofambt 3. die Ceremonien Christi 4. unterschiedt der gottheyt und menschheit Christi 5. die sendung und wort eines newen propheten 6. gebet und gut werck Corneli.
>
> Proverb. XXI. Es ist dem gerechten ain freud zu thun was recht is, aber ein forcht dem übelthäter. Nit was, sondes das. MDXXXI.

An approximate translation into English follows:

> A Clear, Very Necessary Instruction Against a Number of Deceptive, Furtive Spirits, Who Are Secretly Proceeding in Such a Way that Many Pious Hearts are Led Astray and Seduced. In Brief, A Presentation in the Form of a Faithful Warning Concerning: 1. The Apostolic Office; 2. The Office of Bishop; 3. The Ordinances of Christ; 4. The Distinction Between the Divinity and Humanity of Christ; 5. The Sending and Word of a New Prophet; 6. The Prayer and Good Work of Cornelius.
>
> [Proverbs XXI [15]: It is a Joy to a Righteous Man to do what is Right: but a Dread to the Evildoer. Not what (or, was), but that. MDXXXI.

A copy of this booklet was preserved in Strasburg, France until the year 1870, when it was destroyed by fire. Johann Wilhelm Baum (1809-79) evidently examined the booklet. He mentions it in his *Thesaurus Epistolicus Reformatorum Alsaticorum*. This work exists only in manuscript. Several decades ago Abraham Hulshof published the title page of this now lost booklet by Marpeck in a doctoral dissertation, submitted to the University of Amsterdam. Hulshof obtained the title from *Thes. Baum.*, III, p. 388. Beside the title, Baum had written, "s. l. 4 bogen 8°." This probably means that the title (as given by Hulshof) is page one; that the booklet had four signatures, probably totaling sixty-four pages; and that it was in octavo form. The phrase following Proverbs 15:21 is not clear.

The booklet was a polemic, being directed against Hans Bünderlin, a follower of the noted mystic, Hans Denck. Dr. Hulshof observed that it was probably not identical with either of Marpeck's booklets which were censured in 1531. See further, A. Hulshof: *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg van* 1525 *tot* 1557 . . . , Amsterdam, 1905, p. 99.

On page 507 of the *Vindication* the Brethren state that in former years they had defended their Christology against "a number of spirits." In case this is a reference to a written work, it was assuredly this Marpeck booklet of 1531, also directed against "a number of deceptive, furtive spirits."

John Horsch of Scottdale, Pennsylvania, recently noted a reference to Marpeck's *Testament Explanation,* which I had not found. G. Thormann made mention of the Anabaptist "Concordance" as follows: "Ihr wisset, liebe Brüder, . . . was für ein Wesen sie [die Täufer] auch von ihrem Concordantzen büchlein machen." Thormann's observation is of no significance, except that it indicates that the volume had achieved a sufficient circulation to attract the attention of those not affiliated with the Anabaptists. In an earlier article I noted Jacob Andreae's reference to the volume, 1568 (*The Mennonite Quarterly Review,* July, 1938, pp. 162f.). Thormann's observation is found in his *Probier-Stein oder Schriftmässige . . . gewissenhaffte Prüfung des Täufertums* . . . Bern [Switzerland], in Hoch-Obrigkeitlicher Druckerey, 1693, p. —.

An effort will be made to locate a copy of this Marpeck booklet, should it have been preserved in any other library than in Strasburg. Correspondence on this point, as well as on any other phase of the life, or the theology, of Marpeck will be heartily appreciated by the present writer.

THE MENNONITE QUARTERLY REVIEW

Index to Volume XII, 1938

JANUARY

Editorial 2
The Persecution of the Evangelical Anabaptists
John Horsch 3
The Theology of Conrad Grebel, I
Harold S. Bender 27
Attendance at Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1936-1937
Silas Hertzler 55

APRIL

Editorial 70
Mennonites and Culture
C. Henry Smith 71
Brief Notes on the Bernese Wengers
John C. Wenger 85
Early Mennonite Sunday School Lesson Helps
John Umble 98
The Theology of Conrad Grebel, II
Harold S. Bender 114

JULY

Special Pilgram Marpeck Number

Editorial 136
The Life and Work of Pilgram Marpeck
John C. Wenger 137
Pilgram Marpeck's Confession of Faith, 1531
A Hitherto Unpublished Document Transcribed and Edited from the Original by
John C. Wenger 167

OCTOBER

Editorial 204
The Theology of Pilgram Marpeck
John C. Wenger 205
Attendance at Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1937-1938
Silas Hertzler 257
Additional Note on the Life and Work of Pilgram Marpeck
John C. Wenger 269